



April 26. 1692.

Imprimatur,

Gabr. Quadring, Procan.

Jo. Beaumont.

Job. Covell.

C. Roderick.





April 26. 1692.

Imprimatur,

Gabr. Quadring, Procan.

Jo. Beaumont.

Job. Covell.

C. Roderick.



ANNOTATIONS
UPON
Some DIFFICULT
TEXTS
In all the
BOOKS
OF THE
New Testament.

By *S^r Norton Knatchbull K^t & Bar^t.*



CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by *J. Hayes*, Printer to the University;
for *W. Graves* Bookseller there. 1693.

2. 3. 1

7 2. 3.



THE
PUBLISHER
TO
The Reader.

These Annotations are entirely the
product, and result of all those
Critical Researches into, and
most solid and happy Conjectures upon
the most Difficult passages of the New
Testament, made by the sincerely Re-
ligious, and profoundly Judicious, as well
as Learned Author, the late S^r Norton
Knatchbull K^t and Bar^t: and which
are only and altogether his own particular
discoverys, and most Select observations.
Upon which account, that most distinguishing

The Publisher

character, and singular Elogy given by
 Act. 17. 11. S^t Luke to those more no-
 Eὐχρηστοί. ble Berean Converts, is most
 eminently due to Him, who with a like truly
 noble and generous disposition, with the same
 pious intention, and application of mind, and
 Ἀναξιῶντες With equal success, daily
 τῶν τούτων γε- searched (or as that word
 φάσ. imports, and more signifi-

cantly might be rendred) critically con-
 ferred, or compared the Scriptures to-
 gether, whether those things were so.
 Of which most exact and diligent scru-
 tiny of his into those Holy Oracles, this
 evident proof, and lasting Monument will
 remain to Posterity; which therefore by
 most Competent Judges is thought most wor-
 thy to be recommended, and communicated,
 as a more usefull, elaborate, and succesful
 Essay in its kind then hath hitherto been
 publish'd. In which, the most proper sense,
 and right use of each ambiguous particle,
 word, and phrase; and likewise the ge-
 nuine

to the Reader.

nuine construction of all those intricate periods, obscure transitions, and most perplexing trajections which occur frequently in those Sacred Writers, are vindicated, and cleared, by a more plain, and accurate Version, or a more intelligible, and commodious Exposition of them. Concerning which, perhaps it may not be impertinent to give the Learned Reader especially, this further Advertisement; namely, that this is not a bare Translation only of the former Latin Edition thrice Printed at Oxford, which is now put into his hands; but this English Copy (as that word is commonly understood by the Booksellers,) may rather be esteemed as an Original Piece, or a new, more compleat, and perfect draught, begun, and finished afterwards by the same hand; by which it is besides very much enlarged with divers interpolations, and an addition of new Remarques upon several other Texts. The whole Work, with the Latin Preface now set before it, as it was

The Publisher, &c.

also found together with it, being fairly transcribed, and prepared for the Press, by the Author himself, as tis most probably supposed, not long before his death.

Trin. Coll.

Febr. 14th 169³.

J. L.

AN
ENCOMIASTICK
Upon the Most Learned and Judicious
AUTHOR
OF
These *Critical Annotations.*

SOME have the race of Glory vainly run :
Have Countries spoil'd, and Cities vilely won :
From hence those Triumphs, and that *Grandeur* rise,
Which Flatt'ers have exalted to the Skies ;
Whilst tears still swell the vanquish'd captives eyes. }

Knatchbull a diff'rent Conquest has obtain'd,
Old *Greece* subdu'd, and *Palestine* regain'd ;
Has o're the Empire of the Romans run,
And view'd the Regions of the rising Sun.
From thence has ample spoils, and Trophies brought,
T' enrich the soul, and to adorn the thought.
No tears upon th' unbloudy conquest wait ;
His Gentler vict'r'y makes the conquer'd great.

As in a Map the world describ'd we find,
And spacious Kingdoms to a spot confind :
So here, this little Volume does contain
The Vast *Ideas* of a thoughtful brain :
Like Chrystal bright, and solid too, they shine
In each elab'rate page, in every Line.
Our errors they reform, our doubts dispel,
And all our weak opposing force repel.

No

No dry dull periods here our Fancies cloy;
Deep sense, and manly lines our wits imploy.
Here no impertinence provokes our rage;
Nor empty bubbles swell the frothy page;
But weighty Truths our studious thoughts engage.

Some Books like Deserts, are of vast extent:
Much time and pains to trace them o're is spent.
Now here, Now there, an useful Plant is found:
We traverse then large Tracts of moorie ground
Where only Moss and barren Fern abound.
In devious paths or'e rugged Hills we go,
Whose Tops are cover'd with eternal snow,
Scarce once saluted by a human face:
Dragons and Owls possess the baleful place.

This, like a Plat of rich enclosed Mead,
Is all with Flowrie grass, and herbs or'espread;
And yet no *Serpent* in the *Grass* lies hid.
From ev'ry part surprizing scenes arise,
And charming objects feed our longing eyes.
New fresh delights so croud upon the brain,
We're forc'd from too much pleasure to refrain:
Excess of Joy's converted into pain.

Some have to men assign'd a Monstrous birth,
That they first sprang like Mushrooms from the earth.
Can such mean thoughts debase the *Great* and *Wise*?
Nothing from earth but earthly things arise.
The senseless clod may flesh and blood impart;
Heav'n claims the glory of our nobler part.
The finest *Atoms*, in their nimblest dance,
To sense and reason never could advance.
This truth our Authors Matchless works proclaim,
Which nothing but immortal wit could frame;
Which will endure 'till th' Universal Flame.

Happy

Happy the man whose uncorrupted Soul,
No vicious passions fetter, and controul
From soaring up to its celestial seat ;
Contemning what the giddy World calls Great.
Whose willing heart cleaves to the Sacred Laws
As close as Iron which the Loadstone draws.
These are his study, these his chiefest Joy,
These both his Youth, and riper years employ.
Such was our Author ; such was his delight :
Twas food by day, and rest to him by night,
To search the Records of the Will divine,
A rich and yet an inexhausted *Mine*.
Great Man ! endu'd with more than human Arts:
Such heav'nly knowledge heav'n alone imparts.

Now he augments the number of the Blest.
His Labours end in everlasting rest,
And hospitable Saints careſs their welcome gueſt. }
Nor *ſo* hath left this World ; but that his Name
Is born aloft upon the wings of Fame.
Ev'n for his ſake theſe lines may chance to live ;
For *his* to them will life, and luſtre give.
As Oaks the Ivy which enclaſps them round,
They'll bear *them* up from ſinking to the Ground.

Sid. Coll.

Feb. 8th 1691

Tho. Walker.



*Books Printed for and sold by W. Graves
Bookseller in Cambridge.*

Petavii Tabulæ Chronolog. Fol.

A Sermon preached before the University of *Cambridge* in *Kings College* Chappel on the 25th of *March* being the Anniverfary for Commemoration of King *Henry VI.* the Founder, by *W. Fleetwood*,

Divine Hymns, or a Paraphrafe upon the *Te Deum*, &c. and the Song of the Three Children, by *T. Walker*, B. D. Fellow of *Sidney Sufex College*. 4°

P. Terentii Carthaginienfis Afri Comædiæ Sex. Interpretatione & Notis illustravit Nicholaus Camus J. U. D. Juffu Chriftianiffimi Regis, in ufum sereniffimi Delphini. 8°

Inſcriptionum Antiquarum ſylloge in duas Partes diſtributa. Prior Inſcriptiones Ethnicas, &c. Altera Chriſtiana Monumenta, &c. by *W. Fleetwood*.

An Enquiry into Four Remarkable Texts of the N. Teſt. which contain ſome difficulty in them, with a probable Reſolution of them, by *John Edwards*. 8°

Burguldicus and Heereboords Logicks 8°

Enchiridion Militis Chriſtiani, Auctore D^{no}. Eraſmo Roterdamo, Ejusdem de Præparatione ad mortem, &c. 12°

De Chriſto imitando, Contemnendiſque Mundi Vanitatibus libellus Authore Thoma Kempriſio, libri Tres, interprete Sebaſtiano Caſtellione. Quibus adjungitur Liber Quartus de Czna Dominica Latine redditus, una cum Micis aliquot Epiderpidum, per *R. Widdrington* S. T. D. 12°

Vincetii Lirinenſis Adverſus profanas omnium novitates Hæreticorum Commonitorium. Cum Notis V. C. Stephani Baluzii. Adjicitur S. Auguſtini Liber de Hæreſibus, 12°.



LECTORI S.

HAbes hic, Amice Lector, animad-
versiones nostras in Libros Novi
Testamenti ultimâ manu jam auctas, & e-
mendatas, absque omni partium Studio, ut
antea dixi, ruri exaratas, ut ex ipso stylo
vel primos enties intuitu. Aliqua quæ non
ita necessariò faciebant ad sacrum codicem
(quod præcipuè fuit in voto) à solacif-
mis quos vulgò tam in Expositione quàm
in Versione sacris Scriptoribus impingunt
interpretes vindicandum, de industria præ-
termisi, ne te nimio lassarem tadio. A-
liqua jam etiam addidi, Aliqua emendavi.
Quod si quis arguat recessisse à sensu ve-
terum vel recentiorum interpretum, ut jam
priùs dictum, non est quod reponam. Imò
si id non fecissem, omninò non scripsissem.
Rursus verò dico me utrisque vehementer
suam debere reverentiam, sed nec meam

Lectori S.

nec alterius fidem velim mancipari. Si quid profecerim in voto, mercedem habeo, sin minus, operam non totus perdidici; in magno conatu est voluisse aliquid. Unicum tantum monendum superest. Quòd si quis suspicetur plagii, quo nihil magis horreo, & fortè dicat Animadversiones ex nostris aliquas mutuatas vel excerptas esse ex notis τῆς μακαρίτης Hammondi nostri in Libros Novi Testamenti, quales sunt in verba illa, τῆς ποιῆν ἐκδετα, Act. 7. 19. Τῷ δὲ δωαμῶν, Rom. 16. 25. καὶ ἐξαράν τ' πορνῶν, 1 Cor. 5. 13. εἰ μὴ ἐκείνῳ, 1 Cor. 7. 17. Τιμῆς ἡγοράσθῃ, 23. πλεον τ' Ἀβελ, Heb. 12. 24. & perpaucissimæ quædam aliæ: Sciat velim, ex nostris istas aliquas à nobis esse Scriptas priùs quam ejus erant omninò editæ, neque in ejus prima editione omninò extitisse, at ab ipso in secunda fuisse additas postquam chartas nostras, quas ei pro diuturna inter nos amicitia rogatus non negare poteram, perlegisset, & in suum usum quas voluit accomodasset. Cujus rei testem non desiderarem nisi ipsum, si in vivis permanisset. Etsi rem ipsam abundè testari

Lectori S.

testari possem ex variis inter me & ipsum datis literis, & chartis. Nec id solum, sed etiam sciat, ipsum me ingenter animasse, ut in incepto pergerem, & nostras etiam publicis mandarem typis, quod tandem factum est eo ipso anno quo ejus erant secundò editæ, viz. 1659. Neque hæc dixissem sed omnino siluissem, si non Vir Doctissimus nuper in sua Synopsi Criticorum quasdam ex nostris animadversionibus sub ejus nomine Latinè publicasset, adeò ut nisi te hoc etiam monerem publicè, reus forem ego plagii coràm universo literatorum mundo. Hoc te igitur moneri velim. Quisquis verò interim has chartulas perlegeris, pro candore tuo si quid erratum sit, ignosces. Vale.





AN NOT A T I O N S O N S. Matthew.

St Matthew Ch. I. v. 19.



ἸΚΑΙΟΣ *ὦν. Then Joseph her husband being a just man, &c.* and so accordingly read all *Interpreters*. But in my opinion as we ought to speak, so ought we to interpret, if lawfully we may, to the capacity of the vulgar. It being therefore familiar to have recourse to the *Idiorisms* in the Old Testament for the explanation of words or phrases in the New, as even to prophane Authors also, and the involved or complexed sense in this place such as is *just* in the general signification, being not so explicit and plain, as that it can be rightly understood of the common sort of people, the particular and specifick one, whose reason the meanest capacity understands at first sight, is surely the more fit and proper,
B and

and that is, *merciful*. For if the *Evangelist* in this place had intended *Joseph* as a *just man*, in the common acception of the word, then ought *Joseph* as a *just man* to have made her an example, and to have divorced her publickly according to the law, *Deut. c. 24. v. 1.* but he was not willing to make her an example, but was minded to put her away privily, which plainly argues by that intention that he was *merciful* rather than *just*. And therefore the translation were more proper, *Then Joseph her husband being a merciful man, Misericors existens, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily.* And for this Translation we have the Authority of the Old Testament, where the word מֵרַחֵם which properly signifies an affection of piety and mercy, and that in the very places, wherein we commonly render it *mercy* or *merciful*, the *Greek Translators* render according to the variation of the points, *διεχοσύνη*, or *διεχέω*. As *Gen. c. 19. v. 19.* Καὶ ἐμεγαλυνας τὴν διεχοσύνην σου, *Et magnificasti misericordiam tuam, And thou hast magnified thy mercy.* *c. 20. v. 13.* Ταύτην τὴν διεχοσύνην ποιήσεις εἰς ἐμέ, *Hanc misericordiam facies mecum, This is thy kindness which thou shalt shew unto me.* *Exod. Ch. 15 v. 13.* ὠδηγήγησας τῇ διεχοσίῳ σου, *Dux fuisti in misericordia tua populo quem redemisti, Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast*

redeemed. *Isai. c. 57. v. 1.* καὶ ἄνδρες δίκαιοι ἀρροῦνται, Et viri misericordiae colliguntur, And merciful men are taken away. And so in many other places. So *Chrysostom* διὰ τοῦ οὗ ὡς, τὸ ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς καὶ ἐπιεικὲς, i. e. *Mitis & benignus* that is meek and courteous. Whom *Theophylact* expresseth yet more plainly, οὐκ ἐβουλετο ἀπλῶς εἶναι, &c. *Noluit crudelis esse, &c.* He would not be cruel, but used her with all gentleness and mercy.

V. 24, 25. καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν, ἕως ἃς ἐπέκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον. And he took unto him his wife, and knew her not till she had brought forth her first born son. That is from the time he took her home unto him, unto the time she brought forth her first born son he knew her not, to wit, the whole intervenient time, in which she was with child. And all this the Evangelist doth purposely record, that he may take away all pretence of cavil, and fix it for an undeniable truth, that *Jesus* was not onely conceived of a Virgin, but also of a pure Virgin born. Least any prying inquisitor, by sinisterly interpreting the words of *Isaiah* going immediately before, might chance to argue Thus, *Isaiah* truly saith, a Virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a son, but he saith not, a Virgin shall bring forth a son; For he might say, she was a Virgin when she conceived, and yet not when she brought forth.

Neither can there be any thing else ingeniously or fairly drawn from these words.

C. 2. v. 6. *Οὐδαμῶς ἐλάττω*. Nequaquam minima, *In no wise the least*; or, as we translate it, *art not the least*. This place as to the words doth diametrically fight with that in *Micah* c. 5. v. 2. out of which nevertheless it was probably cited, it being not to be found in any other Prophet. *And thou Bethlehem art not the least*, as it is here in *Matth*. *And thou Bethlehem Ephratah art little*, as it is in *Micah*. Though as to the sence all Expositors agree they both mean the same thing. But they say this place in *Matt*. is the more significant and plain, supposing that he restored it to its original and proper meaning. Whenas in truth the words are not the words of *Matthew*, being onely by him historically recited, but properly the words of the high Priest and Scribes, who answered *Herod* upon his demand, where *Christ* should be born, *In Bethlehem of Judea, for so it is written by the Prophet. And thou Bethlehem in the Land of Juda art not the least among the Princes of Juda, &c.* And that they so answered according to the reading of the *Greek Bibles* which were then among them common, I think there is no cause to doubt. But this difference in the reading giving a just occasion to inquire farther into the reason and mystery thereof, I hope it will be an offence to none, at least to move the question

question, whether it may not be possible that some fault might creep into this place of *Micah* by the neglect or inadvertency of one of the first Transcribers, (whom afterwards posterity did follow with a well meaning and uninquiring faith) when as it is so prone and easie to mistake in the *Hebrew* letters, because of the great likeness of the Characters, as that such mistakes have been in many places is not to be denied. And if so, why may there not have been a mistake in this word צע"ר, *Little*, which perhaps should have been rather read, צער, *Go forth*, an error apt enough to be committed by reason of the similitude of the Characters of ך, and ך. and ' and ך. Neither is this a new thing in the sacred Page, for the *Greek Interpreters* did certainly mistake in this very word, *Gen. c. 49. v. 22.* reading צעה and rendring νεώτατος, *adolescencior, younger*, instead of צעה incidebat, or discurrebant, as in the *English*, *whose branches did run over the wall*. And the like error is also as easie between ' and ך. And so it happeneth in all the four forementioned letters in one and the same word, *Ezek. c. 34. v. 16.* Where the *Greek Interpreters* instead of אשמך, *I will destroy*, read, אשמך, φυλάξω, *I will keep*. And if this mistake be granted to be probable, as it is so possible in this place of *Micah*, then will the sence be without all difficulty plain and extreamly suitable

to the scope thereof, ראתה ביתלחם אפרתה צעדר להיות. Et tu Bethlehem Ephrata progredere, or according to the force of the Hebrew, Cum pompâ progredere, ut sis inter Chiliadas Judæ, &c. *And thou Bethlehem Ephrata go forth or march forth with pomp that thou maist be among the thousands of Judæ, for out of thee shall be come forth who shall be ruler in Israel.* And if I affirm this to be probable, what new thing do I assert, that the most learned and judicious Capellus hath not already abundantly asserted in his *Sacred Criticks*?

C. 2. v. 10. Ἰδόντες δὲ τὸν ἀστὲρα, Subaudi, ἑστῶτα, or ἑστη, *But seeing the Star, understand, stand still, or where it stood.* For its said in the former verse, *And behold the Star which they saw in the East, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was. When therefore they saw the Star stand still, (for they could not but before see the Star which they followed for their guide) they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.*

V. 16. Ἀπὸ διετῶς καὶ κατωτέρω, A bimatu & infra, as the *Old Latin*, a bimulo & infra, as others, *From two years old and under, in our own.* But read which you will, either διετῶς substantively, or διετῶς adjectively understanding πνυθῆς, it matters not, whilst all mean the same with the *English*, ἀπὸ διετίας πλινω-

πληρωθείς. As it is said, *Acts c. 24. v. 27.*
 A biennio expleto, *From after two years, or
 from two years and under.* Which sence I
 can by no means think agreeable to this place,
 but that the words are rather to be rendred
 and understood according to the manner of
 speech with both *Greeks* and *Latins*, and the
 very scope and reason of the place, in this
 manner, *Then Herod when he saw that he was
 mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth,
 and sent forth and slew all the male children
 that were in Bethlehem and all the coast there-
 of,* ἀπὸ διετῶς, that is, ἀπὸ διετίας ἀναρῶντος,
 and not πληρωθείς, a biennio, or bimatu in-
 cipiente, and not expleto, or a bimulo & in-
 fra, *From a two yearing child and under,* that
 is, as I suppose *Piscator* means, incipiendo a
 bimulis exclusivè & descendendo ad eos qui
 infra bimatum erant; as if he had said, *All the
 male children of a year old and under,* accor-
 ding to the time he had diligently inquired
 of the *wise men.* For from a full whole year
 and upward a child beginneth to be called
 with the *Hebrews* בן שנה, filius duorum
 annorum, with the *Greeks* διετῶς, with the
Latins, Bimus. In which sence the LXX do
 I conceive rightly translate בן שנה, δευτέρῳ
 ἔτει, secundo anno post diluvium, *Gen. c. 11.
 v. 10.* And so reads *S^t Augustin, de civit.
 Dei. lib. 5.* so *Noah* is said to be, בן
 שש מאות שנה Sexcentorum annorum filius, a

son of six hundred years תשנ"ו שש תנ"ו in
 sexcentesimo anno vitæ suæ, in the six hun-
 dredth year of his life, Gen. c. 7. v. 6. and
 11. So thought *Hesychius* διέτις, δι' ὅλου τῆς
 ἐτους, that is, post annum integrum, after a
 whole year, as if then a child began to be or to
 be called διέτις, δια being put for μετὰ, which
 is usually done, cum de interjecto tempore di-
 citur, as δι' ἐτῶν ἑξήκον τετρακισίων, post annos
 fere quadringentos, Plut. δι' τῆς ἐνός καὶ ἡμίσεως,
 post annum unum & dimidium, Anonym. δι'
 ἐτῶν ὅ πλειονον, post plures annos, Act. c. 24.
 v. 17. And so ἀπὸ διέτους, ought to be ren-
 dered from after a whole year; so also *A-*
ristotle understood the word lib. 9. c. 5. de
 hist. Animal. whose words there of the Hart
 or Stag are these, Φύουσι ὅ διέτεις παρῶν τὰ
 κέρατα, bimi primum generant cornua, the
 two yearings first generate horns. Now there is
 nothing more certain then that they begin to
 generate their horns as soon as they are once a
 full year old, and have entred into the se-
 cond, at which time they begin to be called
 διέτεις, and so continue to be called, until in
 the end of that second year they begin to cast
 them. And to demonstrate this more plainly,
 that which with us is called the Calf of a
 red Deer, or the Fawn of a Fallow, the whole
 space of the first year, is with him called
 ἐνιαύσιον, as also a Lamb in the Scripture
 is with the Hebrews called בן-שנה, with the
 Greek

Greek Interpreters ἐνιδύοντες, with the Latins, Anniculus, with the English, *A lamb of the first year*. And what with us is termed a brocket or a pricket, the whole space of the second year of his age, is with him termed πατ-
 Τάλια or διετής, in Latin subulo or bimus, in the beginning of which year he begins to generate his horns, and in the end thereof to cast them. Τῷ ὃ τρίτῳ ἔτι, as he saith, that is, *as soon as they enter into the third year of their age*, διουρῶ ὑμεῖς, bifida generant, *they begin to have forked horns*, and are called that third year of their age with the Latins, trimi, with the English, *spaydes* or *forells*. Where note that διετής, and τῷ ὃ τρίτῳ ἔτι with him are all one and the same manner of phrase, so as he might have as well said, τῷ ὃ δούτῳ ἔτι as διετής, and τρίετής as well as τῷ ὃ τρίτῳ ἔτι. From whence it manifestly appears, that ἀπὸ διετῆς may be taken either à bimatu incipiente, or desinente, *from the time a child begins to be two years old*, or *from the time they cease to be so*, the preposition ἀπὸ being exclusive to the one or to the other, to the beginning or to the end; but because the word κατωτέρω is here added, I conceive it ought to be taken, à bimo, or bimatu incipiente, *from the time the child begins to be two years old*, or *from a two year-
 ing child and downward*, as contrarywise, 2. Chron. c. 31. v. 16, where it is said ἀπὸ
 τρίετῆς

τριετὺς καὶ ἐπαινῶ, it cannot but be understood of
 children of three years of age complete. *A*
nato tres annos & deinceps, as *Jun.* as if it
 were said, ἀπὸ τριετίας πληρωθείσης. So also
 where *Aristotle* saith, *lib. 2. c. 1. de hist. A-*
nimal. Ἀποβάλλει ὃ τὰ κέρατα μόνον ἐλαφύ
 κατ' ἔτος ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ διετὺς, καὶ πάλιν
 φύει. *Cervus solus singulis annis abjicit cor-*
nua, incipiens [abjicere] a bimatu, & rursus
gene.at, The Stag alone casts his horns every
year, beginning to cast them, from two years
old, and then again he breedeth new ones; it
cannot be otherwise understood, then ἀπὸ δι-
ετίας πληρωθείσης, a bimatu expleto, from two
years expired, for until that time they cast not
their horns, but then immediately in the en-
trance of their third year, πάλιν φύει, they
again generate new ones, as was said be-
fore, τὸ ὃ τρίτῳ ἔτει διχροῦ φύει. If there-
 fore the *Evangelist* had meant children of
 two years of age complete, he would surely
 have said, ἀπὸ τριετὺς καὶ κατωτέρω. *A trimatu*
& infra, from three years old and under, or from
a three yearing child and under. For certainly
 there must be a difference between, *A bi-*
matu & infra, and *a bimatu & supra*. Nei-
 ther is the *Latin* manner of speech at all un-
 like unto the *Greeks*: For *bimus* and *διετὺς*,
bimatu and *διετία*, *trimus* and *τριετὺς*, have
 one and the same signification. *Bimus*, com-
 monly, *qui in bimatu est. Bimā dies*, that
 is

is bimatus, tempus biennii, Vall. lib. 4. c. 80. We have also in the vulgar Latin. *Isai. c. 15. v. 5.* Vitulam conternantem. i. e. as *Grammarians* expound, quæ est in complexione tertii anni, that is in the compass of her third year, which with the LXX is called δαμάλις πρώτη, with the Arabick, vitula trima, as the *Latin* expounds it. So that from both manner of speeches either *Greek* or *Latin*, we must necessarily conclude, that not one two yearing child was slain of *Herod*, but onely those who were one year old complete and under, all who perisht to the Babe that was newly born. And now it remains to demonstrate, how this interpretation is more suitable to reason, and the scope of the place. And that especially for this cause, for that *Herod* slew the children, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἠκρίβωσε παρὰ τοῦ μάγον, secundum tempus quod exquisierat a Magis, According to the time which he had inquired out of the wise men. And this was the time wherein the Star appeared to them in the East, according to the computation whereof, supposing that *Christ* was born about that time he slew the children. Now I do not conceive it agreeable to reason to say, that the Star appeared two whole years before the wisemen came to *Jerusalem*, which notwithstanding some have thought, being I suppose carried away with the *Vulgar* interpretation. For it is scarce credible,

ble, but that the wise men did immediately after the appearing of the Star begin to prepare themselves for their journey, in the expedition whereof they could not have spent two whole years, had they come from the farthest parts of the world, much then surely less if they came no farther then from *Arabia*, that is conterminous to *Judaea*. And that they came from thence there are many convincing arguments, First, for that the Text saith, that they came to *Jerusalem* out of the *East*. Now that *Arabia* is scited on the *Eastern* side of *Judaea* the *Scripture* witnesseth in divers places, as *Gen. c. 10. v. 30. c. 25. v. 6.* and elsewhere. As doth also *Tacitus* in his description of *Judaea*, *Terra finesque qua ad Orientem vergunt Arabia terminantur*, and *Ptolomæus Geograph. lib. 5. c. 16.* Παλαιστίνη ἡ Ἰουδαία Συρία περιερίζεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ μεσημβρίας Ἀραβία Περσῶν, *Palestina Judaea Syria terminatur ab Oriente & Meridie Arabia Petraea, &c.* Secondly, because there were *Magi* or *Wise men* also in *Arabia*, as *Grotius* shews by many arguments. Thirdly, They presented gifts singularly proper to that Country, *Gold, Frankincense and Myrrhe*, of the abundance, pureness and excellency of each whereof in that Country you may see the testimonies of various Authors in *Bochart. Geograph. sac. par. 1.* Nay *Grotius* affirms, *Myrrha non nisi in Arabia nascitur, nec Thus nisi*

nisi apud Sabaos Arabum portionem. Myrrhe also seems to have its denomination from an Arabick primitive מר mur. Fourthly, because of the prophecies, Psal. 72. v. 10. The Kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring gifts, and v. 15. And there shall be given to him of the gold of Saba; and Isai. c. 60. v. 5. and 6. The riches; or forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee, they shall all come from Sheba, they shall bring gold and incense, and shall shew forth the praises of the Lord. These things might be possibly spoken typically of David or Solomon, but primarily surely they look't at Christ, in whom they were truly fulfill'd, when the wise men came to worship him. Fifthly, and lastly, the Arabians were doubly Hebrews, descending from Joctan the son of Heber, and from Abraham by Ketura. And for this it is probable enough, that they were better instructed then other Nations concerning the expectation of a Messias, or that God had more kindness for them, because of their Original, and therefore gave them a more quick and singular notice of the Birth of a Saviour to be born unto the world, that so they might have the preheminance to worship him before any other of the Gentiles. According whereto they are stiled, Primitiæ Gentium, The first fruits of the Nations. If therefore the Wise men came from Arabia, we must sit a time wherein we may determine

mine the Star to have appeared in the *East* (for that the Star was and appeared locally in the *East*, and was not only seen at a far distance as far as *Jerusalem* of the *Wise men* who were in the *East*, as some do say, and that they followed it as their guide I do most firmly believe with our most *Reverend Primate*) from which and in which time the *wise men* may properly be said to have been in their journey out of *Arabia* to *Jerusalem*. Now though *Arabia* be conterminous to *Judea*, yet some parts and regions of it are so far distant from *Jerusalem*, as that reckoning the *Deserts* they were to pass, and the preparations and many impediments which use to accompany such long voyages, you may fitly and lawfully allow them for the finishing of their journey about forty weeks, from the beginning of which time it is not at all absurd to conjecture, (*Et qui in hac re bene conjiciet hunc vatem ego perhibebo optimum, And who in this matter shall conjecture well, is to be reputed the best Prophet.*) that the Star might appear to the *wise men*, to wit about the time of the *salutation of the Virgin*, and the *Conception* of the *Redeemer* of the world; About which time, wherein the Son of God descended from heaven to become the *son of man* in the womb of the *Virgin*, I say again, it is not at all absurd to conjecture that the *wise men* first saw the Star in the *East*, and that

as

as soon as ever they had seen it, *Χρηματιδέντες*, being warned from above, that the Star portended a *King* to be born unto the *Jews*, began forthwith to prepare themselves for their journey to *Jerusalem*, in the expedition whereof when they had spent about the aforesaid forty weeks, they arrived at that city. *Χρηματιδέντες*, I say, warned from above, for I do not believe they were so skill'd in *Balaams* Prophecy or the aspect of the stars, that out of them they could know that that *Star* did portend a *King* to be born unto the *Jews*, unless they had been warned and instructed from above, no more then they knew that *Herod* had it in his mind to slay the child, had they not been first warned by a dream. If then we add to these forty weeks twelve days after the birth of *Jesus* before the day in which the *wise men* came to worship him, which time its reasonable enough to guess they might spend in inquiring out where the *New born King* of the *Jews* might be, and after that, thirty dayes of the *Purification* of *Mary* according to the law, and the *Presentation* of her Son in the Temple were past, about which time its probable the *wise men* returned into their Country, and allowing farther for their return from *Jerusalem* to their own City *Nazaret* when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, *Luk. c. 2. v. 39.* and from thence back again
into

into *Ægypt*, *Matth.* c. 2. v. 14. and 16. according to the order of the *Chronology* of our most reverend *Primate*, before that *Herod* saw that he was mocked of the *wise men*, and became exceeding wroth, and sent and slew the children, six weeks more, you will have in the whole fifty and two weeks, from the time wherein we say that the *Star* first appeared to the *wise men* in the *East*, unto the time wherein *Herod* slew the children; so that it will not be at all besides the scope of the text to say, That *Herod* slew all the male children in and about *Bethlehem*, *ὅσοι διετῆς ἔχοντες*, which were under the second year of their age, or from the second year of their age and under, that is, all who had completed the first year of their age and under, according to the time he had diligently inquired of the *wise men*. But perhaps it may seem more probable, that *Herod* did not stay so long, as till the year was expired, because that was beyond the time of life, according to the time which he had inquired of the *wise men*, but that he rather slew them within the space of a year from the appearing of the *Star*, about which time he thought the *King* of the *Jews* was born, some weeks, that so killing all the male children of a year old, he might be the more sure to kill him whom he so much feared. Though he knew according to the time he had learned of the *wise men*,
 that

that he had not yet attained that age. If any man shall question the distribution of the times, I would have him to know, that it was not in our mind to adjust them so exactly, as that there should be no place left for exception or correction, but that it sufficed me, if what I have here proposed have in it in summ a shew of truth. Or if any shall contend, as many of the Learned do, that these *wise men* came from *Persia*, it is all one to me, whose main design is to demonstrate, το, δις διέτης ἡ κατωτέρα, that à bimatu, or à bimulo & infra, is not rightly understood but of children who were under the second year of their age. And that the *wise men*, wheresoever they were in the East, first saw the Star about forty weeks before the Birth of our Saviour, from which and in which time they were coming to *Jerusalem*, that space of time fitting their journey from some part of *Arabia*, as well as from some parts of *Persia*; though for my part I retain the same opinion firmly with *Grotius* that they came from *Arabia*. En verò quàm absurdum errorem peperit διέτης ἡγε-
 v. ille perperam intellectus? But behold how absurd an error this διέτης χρόν. hath begot being not rightly understood? They are the words of *Joseph Scaliger*, lib. 6. de Emend. Temp. The Error he understood of those who would have *Jesus* to be διέτης, that is, two whole years old when *Herod* commanded
 C the

the male children to be slain à *Bimatu & infra.*

C. 3. v. 2. Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔστι ἐγγύς. Appropinquat enim regnum cælorum, *For the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.* That is, the time of the Gospel, in which Christ the Messias was to reign. And this kingdom began immediately after the Resurrection of Christ, when God according to his Prophet had raised up Christ in the flesh to sit upon his throne, Act. c. 2. v. 30. Psal. 132. v. 11. From the time he said unto his Apostles, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, &c. Matth. c. 28. v. 18, 19.

V. 4. Ἡ δὲ προφητεία αὐτῆς ἵνα ἀκριδὲς καὶ μέλι ἀρξιοῦ. What ἀκριδὲς signifieth here is no small dispute among *Interpreters.* But they generally agree that S^t John did, vesci cibo parabili, feed on such meat or nutriment as nature did offer of herself unto him, without any help of art or cookery, such as was τὸ μέλι ἀρξιοῦ, the wild hony he did feed on. And if so, (though for the most part it be translated *locusts*) surely the tops of the leaves of trees or plants, which some have thought these ἀκριδὲς here to signifie, such as were those κερῆνα, filiquæ, husks or cods wherewith the Prodigal son desired to fill his belly, Luk. c. 15. v. 16. were a much more *Parable* food then that of *Locusts.* Neither have

I read that ever any fed on locusts raw, but they were first prepared by some art or cookery, either boyled, or roasted, or dried in the sun, and after that beat to powder, or dried with smoak and salt, or pickled and eaten with oylé; none of which arts or cookeries can we reasonably suppose the *Baptist* used in the wilderness, where he had no fire to serve his turn, and whether he took the pains to dry them in the sun, or to hunt for them in the fields, there being not like to be many in the wilderness, they for the most part frequenting those places which abound with corn, I submit to sober judgements.

Whereas the *κερανα*, *filiquæ*, *husks* or *cods* of trees were ready at his hand without the pains of labour, art, or cookery. And that these *ακρίδες* were not *locusts*, but *ακρίδες βοτανῶν ἢ φυτῶν*, the tops of shrubs or trees, was the confident Opinion of *Isidor. Pelus. lib. 1. ep. 5.* and 132. Of which opinion also were *Paulinus* and *Nicephorus*, and others whom *Euthymius* and *Theophylactus* mention, neither did it displease our most Learned *D^r Hammond*, nor *Baronius* whose words are these, *Hæc cum scribat Isidorus, & non nisi majorum autoritate, quid de his sentiendum, definiendum nobis non est, sed totum relinquimus lectoris arbitrio, Nam constat Græcam dictionem ακρίδες, & locustam insecti genus infirmas alas habens ad volandum, & summitates*

herbarum significare. When *Isodorus* writes these things, and that with the Authority of the Ancients, what is to be thought of them, is not for us to determine, but we leave it all to the Readers choice, For its apparent that the Greek word *ακριδες* signifies both a kind of insect, that hath weak wings to flie, and the tops of herbs. Besides, that which moves me much, these *νεγκτια*, which I take to be all one with these *ακριδες*, and are so called because reflexed like a horn, and interpreted by the *Latins* *siliqua*, either *ex silo propter forma similitudinem*, as some would have, because *silus appellatur naso sursum versus repando*, and so the tops of these leaves likewise are reversed, or from *εὐλινν* as others, because they have a wooden tast, are and have been anciently with the Germans called, *S^t Johans Brot*, that is, *S^t Johns bread*, as if it were their constant opinion that the *Baptist* fed on the tops of those trees when he abided in the wilderness. So that for these reasons, what ever is so strongly contradicted, I cannot but think that the version with *Baronius* is equally as good, if not more proper, And his meat was the tops of the leaves of trees or shrubs and wild hony. Neither did *Erasmus*, when he had spoken what he could for the maintenance of those who would have locusts here to be understood, confidently assert it, but modestly concluded, *Neque hæc commemoramus, quod omnino*

omnino negem hīc ἀρπιδας accipi posse pro frutice, aut herbæ genere, *Neither dowe speak this, as if I did altogether deny that ἀρπιδας might not here be taken for some shrub or kind of plant.* Now that these Κερατια, husks or cods of the leaves of trees or shrubs in the Countries where they grow, are frequently the food of the poor, and are commonly sold in the streets and Markets in *Italy, Spain and Africa*, and elsewhere, is abundantly testified by Authors. Among the rest *Lobelius* hath it in *Advers.* Multum hæc [nempe filiqua] cognita Nicææ & maris Ligustici accolis, ubi eam esitant pueri etiam & porci, *The filiqua is much known to the inhabitants about Nice, and the Ligurian sea, where the boys eat them and also the hogs.* And *Galen.* 2. de Aliment. Πε-
 ρει Κερατιων, ἐστὶ τὸ ἑδεσμευα κερκωμιον, &c. Est autem pravi succi edulium & lignosum. Proinde satius est à regionibus Orientalibus in quibus nascitur ad nos non importari, *The Keratium is a food of ill juice and woody. Wherefore it were better it were not imported to us out of the Eastern Countries where it grows.* And he was of *Pergamus* in the lesser Asia, on whose side toward the East was *Judea* not very far distant, from whence its very probable they might be imported to *Pergamus* in the time of *Galen*, at least from *Syria* which was conterminous to both, for they were not worth the carriage from far.

C. 4. v. 5. Ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον, *Supra summitatem, Upon the top of the temple.* Πτερύγιον, ἀκρωτέριον, *Fastigium or summitas, Helych. so the Ethiopick Interpreter.* Statuit eum in summitate domus sanctæ, *He set him on the top of the holy house.* Neither was it at that time the business of the Lord to shew a miracle, such as is to stand upon the point of a pinnacle, but he was carried by the Tempter to the top of the Temple there to be set in any part thereof, from whence he might be tempted to cast himself down headlong. The leads or battlements being a sufficient precipice for the Devils purpose.

V. 7. *Jesus said unto him, it is written again.* But to my apprehension its better distinguished and translated thus. Ἐφ' αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν, γέγραπται, *Jesus said again unto him, it is written.* No readier way to stop the Tempters mouth, then with a *Scriptum est.*

C. 5. v. 16. Οὕτω λαμψάτω. This word ὕτω is not in the place of a *conjunction causal*, as it sounds in the *English* translation; *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, &c.* But it is an *adverb of likeness*, which directly answers to the *similitude* which went immediately before, so that properly it is to be rendred as it stands in the *Greek*, *A city that is set on a hill, cannot be hid, Neither do men light a candle and*
put

put it under a tub or bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light to all that are in the room, Οὕτω λαμψατω, In like manner, or even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorifie your father which is in heaven.

V. 19. *ὅς ἐάν οὖν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τῶν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ, Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments. So most interpreters, as if there were some remarkable Emphasis in the expression, these least commandments. But I can by no means think, that Christ did either affect or intend any extraordinary elegance of speech in these words, but that he spake in the common phrase and obvious sence, so as it ought to be rendered by a familiar transposition of the words, Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, &c. The very same with that c. 25. v. 40. ἐνὶ τῶν τῷ ἀδελφῶν μου τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ. Which we translate, Unto one of the least of these my brethren.*

V. 42. *Καὶ τὸν θέλοντα δὰπὸ σε δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς, And from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away. And so accordingly is it in most Translations. But how in construction the words can possibly be rendered so, I do not see. And therefore suppose they should be rather translated thus. Put, or turn him not away that desireth to*

borrow of thee. For ἀποσπείρομαι, though it be the *passive* voice, yet may it have, as many other *passives* have in the *New Testament*, an *Active* signification, and so we find it hath, *Psal.* 132. v. 10. Where *Symmachus* reads, μὴ ἀποσπείρῃς τὸ πρῶτον τῷ χειρὶ σου. *Turn not away the face of thine anointed*, as our *English* according to the *Hebrew* read it.

C. 6. v. 2. Ἀπέχου τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν, *They have their reward.* Yet in the foregoing verse tis said, *if ye do your alms to be seen before men*, μισθὸν σου ἔχεις, *Ye have no reward*, or rather the *present* being put for the *future*, *Ye shall have no reward from your father which is in heaven.* Why then should it be said in the immediately following words, that *hypocrites* who do the same thing with the same purpose *to be seen of men*, have their reward? Is not this a contradiction? Surely its more agreeable to the context and to reason, that if any do their alms in the streets or Synagogues, that they may have the glory of men, such persons should be said rather not to have, that is to loose, then to have their reward. To reconcile therefore these words in either verse to one and the same sense, I would translate these latter words quite different from the former. *Verily I say unto you*, ἀπέχου τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν, *They forbid or hinder their reward.* By seeking the praise of men, they forbid their reward from
God,

God, from whom its no reason they should expect any, when they did their *alms before men to be seen of them*, v. 1. I am not ignorant, that the first and common sense is endeavoured to be salved with a proper (as some think) distinction. That is, They have a worldly and perishing reward, but not an heavenly and during one. But what need is there of so faint a sence, or forc^t distinction, if the sence be plain without it, and the use of words do lawfully bear it? But certainly the use of words will bear it, for with all *Lexicographers*, καλύω, ἀπέχω, and ἐμποδίζω, signifie one and the same thing, that is, *to forbid or hinder*. And in this sence by the leave of the Learned *Beza* and *Grotius*, would *Plutarch*, who I suppose never dreamed of the distinction of a worldly and heavenly reward, have the same word understood in his *Solon*, where relating something which seemed hard by the *sanction* of the laws, to wit, that those who were born of harlots were not bound by the law to nourish or relieve their Parents, as they were who were legitimately born. He gives the reason in the words following, Ὅ γὰρ ἐν γάμῳ παρῶν τὸ καλόν, ἢ τέκνων ἐνεκα δῆλός ἐστι, ἀλλ' ἡδονῆς ἀγέρμῳ. γυναικα, τὸν τε μισθὸν ἀπέχῃ, καὶ παρρησίαν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὰς γενομένης ὅσα ἀπολέλοιπεν, οἷς αὐτὸ τὸ γενέσθαι πεποινηκεν ὀνειδῶ. Which words that they may mutually agree, must necessarily be translated

stated thus, *For he that despiseth the honour of marriage, doth plainly shew, he used not a woman for childrens sake, but for his lust, and forbids his reward, and hath not left himself the liberty to speak to those he hath begot, whose very being he hath made their shame.* In that he hath not left himself the liberty to speak to those he hath begot, he *forbids* or *hinders* his reward, to wit, of *alimony*, the very thing in question, which it was free for the Parents to have required of all their children that were honestly born. I find the same word likewise in the same *Author*, in his book of the *failing of Oracles*, ἰδὲν ἀπέχει τιὼ μαντικῇ ἀναθυμίασιν, *Nothing hinders the spirit of divination, &c.* As also in *Dion. Halic.* ἰδέσ με ἀπέχει φόβος, μὴ ὅτι ἂ φερῶ λέγειν, *No fear shall hinder me from speaking what I think.* Since therefore there is so good authority for the use of the word in this sense, and that it agrees so well with the context, and needs no strained distinction for its explanation, I see no reason, why it should not be so accordingly translated, *Verily I say unto you, they hinder their reward.* For surely it is a vanity to fly to a mystical sense, where we have a literal. And thus I suppose 'tis necessary to determine in all the *Parallel* places where the word is used.

C. 9. v. 5, 6. The common pointing and inconvenient division of the verses
together.

together with the parenthesis do so involve the sense, that it was not without cause that *Erasmus* said *orationem esse duriusculam*, That it was a harsh kind of speech. For remedy whereof, it is but pointing and distinguishing thus, v. 5. *Τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐχεσθῆναι, εἰπεῖν, ἀφαινεῖν σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν, ἔγχεαι καὶ περιπατήεις; ἵνα γὰρ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῇ γῆς ἀφαινεῖν ἁμαρτίας;* v. 6. *Τότε λέγει τῷ πᾶσι τῷ ὄχλῳ, ἔγχεαι ἀρον σου πῶς κλίνῃς καὶ ὑπάγεις εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, ὅτι ἡ γὰρ ἐξουσία ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ γῇ τῇ ἡμετέρῃ, ἵνα ἁμαρτίας ἀφαινεῖται.* For which is easier, to say, thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, arise and walk, but that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins? Then saith he to the sick of the Palsie, arise, take up thy bed, and walk. The sense being plainly this, as if he should have said in a few more words, Jesus knowing their thoughts, that they said within themselves, that he blasphemed because he said to the sick of the Palsie, thy sins are forgiven thee, saith unto them, it is all one to me to say, thy sins are forgiven thee, or take up thy bed and walk, but onely that you may know that the Son of man hath power to forgive sins upon earth, therefore I said unto the sick of the Palsie, thy sins are forgiven thee. And then fitly follows, Then saith he to the sick of the Palsie, &c.

V. 18. *Ἀρτι ἐπλήτυσεν, Filia mea modo defuncta est, Vet. and Beza, My daughter*
ter

ter is even now dead, in our Own : but I conceive the Translation were more proper, *My daughter is even or almost dead*. For ἀρτι signifies ὑπομνον, *nigh*, or τὸ ὀφθαλμικὸν μέλλον γινεσθαι, *that which is presently to come*, as well as τὸ παρὸν, *that which is present*, as Phavorinus tells us. So in the parallel places, Mar. c. 5, v. 23. ἐξάτως ἔχθ, *Extremè habet*, or as the *Æthiop.* and *Arab.* *morti vicina est*, or as our English, *lieth at the point of death*, and Luk. c. 8. v. 42. καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπεθνήσκεν, & ea moriebatur, as the *Interlineary* and *Old Translation* hath it, that is ὡς ἀποθνήσκουσα, *erat moribunda*, as the *Syriack* and *Æthiopick* have it, or as we interpret it, *and she lay a dying*. And that she was not altogether dead when the Ruler spake unto Jesus is abundantly manifest by all three stories.

V. 23. Τῆς αὐληταῖς, *Tibicines, the Minstrells or Players on the Flute or Pipe*. That *Flutes* or *Pipes* were used in Funerals among the *Heathen*, we have the testimony of *Ovid*.

Cantabat mæstis tibia funeribus.

In funerals the Flute is sung.

and *Artemidorus*, αὐλεῖν ὃ πυθιγῆς αὐλοῖς πένθος σημεῖναι. *To sound with Pythian Flutes betokens mourning*. Which custom to be in use among the *Jews* *Jeremy* doth seem to intimate, in his Lamentation for the destruction of *Moab*,

Moab, c. 48. v. 36. Καρδία μου ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους
Κεραδὰς ὡς περ αὐλὸς βομβήσῃ, My heart shall
sound like Pipes for the men of Kirheris, that
is with a mourning sound such as the Min-
strels make in Funerals. Such you may sup-
pose to be τὰς κυπιομένους, the mourners that
go about the streets, Eccles. c. 12. v. 5. and
τὰς θρηνέσας, the mourning Women, Jerem.
c. 9. v. 17. So Joseph. αἰώσ. γ. κ. λ. the
Jews are said upon the report of his death
μισθώσασθαι αὐλητάς οἱ θρηνῶν ἐξήρχον αὐτοῖς, to
have hired Minstrels who began their lamenta-
tions to them. As the mourning Women in
the forementioned place of Jeremy, were to
be called to take up a wailing for them. But
that which concerns this place most, is that
of Servius upon Virgil, Majoris ætatis funera
ad tubam proferebantur, minoris ad tibia,
The Funerals of the Elder sort were ushered
with the Trumpet, those of the Younger with
the Flute, or that of Statius,

Tibia cui teneros suctum producere manes
 Pelopen monstrasse ferebant
 Exequiale sacrum carmenq; minoribus umbris
 Utile.

The Flute to usher wont the tender Ghosts
They say that Pelops taught
This mystery and charm for lesser souls.

For this *Daughter* of the *Ruler*, on whose
Funerals the *Minstrels* were *now* ready to
 wait,

wait, is called in this place of *Matth.* *νερά-
σιον*, a little maid. *Mar.* c. 5. v. 23. *θυγα-
τερον*, his little daughter: and *Luk.* c. 8. v.
42. *ὡς ἐτὶ δώδεκα*, About Twelve years of
age.

C. 10. v. 11. *Ἐξετάσας τις ἐν αὐτῇ
ἀξίος ἐστίν*, Enquire who in it is worthy, and
there abide. That is, worthy with whom
ye should abide, *σiletur τὸ νοούμενον*, that which
is intended, is suppress, and understood by the
words subsequent or preceding. So *Matth.*
22. 8. *οἱ κεκλημενοὶ οὐκ ἦσαν ἀξιοί*, They
which were bidden were not worthy, that is,
of the Wedding Feast which was prepared.
For they would not come, but went their
way one to his Farm another to his Trade.
So *Apocal.* 3. 4. *They shall walk with me in
white Robes*, *ὅτι ἀξιοί εἰσιν*. Because they are
worthy so to do for that they have not de-
filed their Garments, & 16. 6. *Thou hast
given them Bloud to drink*, *ἀξιοί γάρ εἰσι*.
For they are worthy to drink Bloud, because
they have shed the Bloud of the Saints, &c.

C. 11. v. 19. *Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν
τέκνων αὐτῆς*, Et justificata est sapientia à filiis
suis, But wisdom is justified of her children.
The proper meaning whereof, or at least a
good one, having relation to the Context is
very difficult to unfold. Why therefore may
it not be better Translated thus? *And This
wisdom is justified of her children; to wit of
the*

the Scribes and Pharisees who thought themselves the only Children or Sons of Wisdom, who sat in the chair of Moses, and loved to be called Rabbi, these were they that justified this Wisdom, that would not attend unto the voice of those that exhorted them to repentance, who said that John had a Devil, and that Jesus was a friend of Publicans and sinners. η is frequently put for $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$, so Hesychius $\tau\lambda\omega$ ξ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\lambda\omega$, as is, \acute{o} , for, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$, $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ or $\epsilon\tau$. Examples whereof you may see, c. 15. v. 12. $\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ τ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, audito isto sermone, when they heard this saying. c. 19. v. 22. the same. Gal. c. 5. v. 8. η $\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\eta$, ista persuasio, this persuasion cometh not from him that calleth you, and so elsewhere.

C. 12. v. 18. $\text{Καὶ κρείσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ, \&c.}$ And he shall preach judgment unto the Gentiles. The words following, $\sigma\eta$ $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\iota\varsigma$ $\&c.$ he shall not strive, $\&c.$ unto $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon$ $\epsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\lambda\eta$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\nu\iota\kappa$ $\tau\lambda\omega$ $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\upsilon$, till he bring forth his judgment in victory, being to be included in a Parenthesis, so that the sence and coherence must be this, He shall preach judgment unto the Gentiles, till he bring forth his judgment in victory, or for ever, as that phrase doth frequently signifie with the LXX. $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\upsilon$ $\epsilon\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon$ τ $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, By judgment he seems to mean his law, $\tau\lambda\omega$ $\omega\varsigma$ τ $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$, the administration of his Church, that is, his Gospel, so Procopius upon Isaiah. The
summ

summ whereof is this, that *Christ* shall cause his Gospel to be preached to the *Gentiles*, till he exalt it in triumph over *Heathenisme*; or *for ever*, that is so that it shall indure for ever, all Nations being converted to the same. The intervenient words, *ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο*, &c. He shall not strive, &c. shewing only his great meekness and tenderness in doing of it.

V. 20. Λίνον τυρόμενον ἔσθω, *Smoking Flax he shall not quench.* But *Flax* is here put by a *Metonymy* for a *Lamp* which is made of *Flax*. *Τυρόμενον* some interpret *extinctioni vicinum*, *near to going out*, others, *caligans*, as we say in *English*, *twinkling*, and others *moribundum*, *dying*, which all express the same meaning. So that to speak to the capacity of the vulgar, it ought to be Translated thus, *He will not extinguish or put out the dying Lamp. Wilt thou break a leaf driven to and fro? and wilt thou pursue the dry stubble?* Job c. 13. v. 25.

V. 43. Δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων, *Through dry places*, that is, *through desert places*, and so reads the *Æthiopick Interpreter*, *per desertum through the desert*. So the word *שׁוֹמֵם* which properly signifies *solitudo*, a *desert*, the *Greek Interpreters* for the most part render *ἀνύδρως*, though sometimes *ἔρημος*, as *Psal. 106. v. 14.* καὶ ἐπειράσαν ἃ θεὸς ἐν ἀνύδρῳ, *And they tempted God in the desert*, and *Isai. c. 43. v. 19.* καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνύδρῳ ποταμὸς, *I will make a way in*

in the wilderness, and Rivers בִּישְׁמוֹן *in the desert.* Our Saviour seems to speak this Parable, as many times he doth, to the sence and opinion of the Vulgar, which probably was the same, that *Pfellus* makes mention of in his book of *Devils*, Τοῖς γὰρ μὲν χαλκὰ τοῖς τόποις συνδιατρίβουσι ψυχῶν ἑσθίως καὶ ἀνικμῆς εἶσι, Quod versentur in locis maxime cæcis, quæ extreme frigida sunt & sicca, *That they abide in the most blind places which are extreemly cold and dry:* who also saith, that there is a certain kind of *Devils cold and dry*, which are called μισοφάεις lucifugi, *haters of the light.* Where by the way we must observe that ἀνυδρῶ and ἀνικμῶ are synonymous. The *Devils* also with the *Syriacks* are called שְׂאֲרִין, from שׁוּר vastavit, *because they abide in vast and desert places*, as *Schindler* observes. And that this opinion was not vain, we may gather from that place of *Matthew*, where our Saviour is said to be led into the wilderness or desert to be tempted of the Devil.

C. 13. v. 44. Ἐκρύψε, Occuluit, *Vet.* Abscondit, *Beza.* Our *Englisb*, *he hideth.* But surely tis more significant to say, *The which when a man had found he concealed it.* For κρύπτω doth signifie, celo, as well as, abscondo, to conceal, as well as, to hide. And to be ingenuous the sence requires it. For the *Treasure* was already hid, which being found the man concealed it, least it should be known

to others. And it had been a vain thing to have hid a new, that which was hid before, and therefore he concealed it.

C. 16. v. 28. *Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not tast of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom.* This place can scarce mystically be understood, by no means literally, but of the coming of the Son of man to the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, who then may truly be said to come in his Kingdom, when he came to Triumph over his enemies the *Jews*, by taking a severe and just vengeance of them. Of his *Resurrection*, which also is called his *Kingdom*, it reasonably cannot. For what wonder were it, if some of the standers by should live to see him coming in his Resurrection, which came to pass in so short a time? But if any of them should live to see the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, which happened so many years after his Passion, that might deserve the notice. And that some of the standers by when our Saviour spake those words, did remain alive to that very day is true and known. And in this sense it is true, *Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled,* c. 24. v. 34. Neither before this time of his coming did the Disciples go over all the Cities of *Israel*, c. 10. v. 23. And in this sense did *John* among others remain a-
live

live till Christ came, whereof see more, Joh. c. 21. v. 22.

C. 17. v. 11. Καὶ καταργήσῃ πάντα, Et consummabit omnia, *And shall finish all things.* The words are literally spoken of *Elias*, but by our *Saviour* interpreted to be meant of *John the Baptist*. And this version seems to me more agreeable, then that which is commonly received, *Elias truly shall first come and restore all things.* My reason is, because in *John the Law and the Prophets had their end.* For the Law and the Prophets were until *John*, from that time the Kingdom of God is preached, Luk. c. 16. v. 6. and Matth. c. 11. v. 12, 13. so that he may more properly be said to finish all things then to restore. And therefore tis said in the last forementioned chapter, v. 11. *Among them that are born of women there hath not Risen a greater [Prophet] then John Baptist, notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of heaven, is greater then he.* That is, the least *Apostle* or *Disciple* under the Gospel, is greater, [for he knew more of the counsel of God and the mystery of Godliness] then the greatest *Rabbi* or *Prophet* under the Law. And surely in this sense it is more fit (which is something to the confirming of our Opinion in this place) to translate the same word, Act. c. 3. v. 21. Ἀλλ' ἅξιον ἐστὶν δοῦναι τιμὴν παντὶ, Quam oportet quidem cœlum recipere usque ad tempora con-

summationis omnium, *Whom the heavens must contain until the times of the consummation of all things*, that is, to the end of the world, when he shall come to judge the quick and the dead; ἀποκατάστασις, τελειώσει, consummatio, *Hesych.* and *Phavor.* and in both I conceive misprinted, ἀποκαταπύουσι, τελειῶσι, for ἀποκαταστήσει, τελειῶσει, *To finish, perfect, or consummate.*

C. 19. v. 28. This verse may be pointed thus, Ὁ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἀναγενθήσεσθε μετ', ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ὅταν καθίσῃ, &c. *And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the Throne of his glory, even ye shall sit upon Twelve Thrones judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel. ἐν αὐτῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, in Renascentia, that is, in Resurrectione, in the Resurrection. So Munster, Hac Secunda generatio est Resurrectio mortuorum. So Augustin, Regenerationem quippe hoc loco, ambigente nullo, novissimam Resurrectionem vocat. Neither should our Lord himself been stiled πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, The first born from the dead, unless the Resurrection had been accounted a παλιγγενεσία, a kind of new Nativity. As Philo Judæus, when the world was as it were born again after the flood, calls it παλιγγενεσίαν.*

C. 22. v. 32. *God is not the God of the dead*

dead but of the living. Our Saviour speaks not this as to the present State of Souls, but he brings it as an argument of the Resurrection of the dead, which is so certain and to God already present, as in the *parallel* place of *Luk. c. 20. v. 38.* *For all live unto him,* that he is in present called the God of the living, meaning those that are dead, that is of *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, who in the last day and not till then shall rise in glory. So as the words plainly and strongly intimate, that there is but one only proper Resurrection of the Soul and Body, against those who would have the Fathers of the Old Testament to have risen and ascended with *Christ*.

C. 24. v. 22. *And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved, but for the Elects sake those days shall be shortened.* Οὐκ ἐσθθη, *Non servaretur ulla caro.* The most received exposition of this place is this. The mutual slaughters in *Jerusalem* (of which *Christ* did now forespeak) were so many and so cruel, that unless the siege of the City had been extreemly hastned, there had not been one Person therein left alive, but they had all killed one another, and utterly destroyed themselves. In consideration whereof God having his chosen ones in the City, whom he was willing to save out of the common calamity, or judgment, put it into the hearts of *Titus* and *Vespasian* to hasten the siege by all

means possible, and so to shorten the days of *Jerusalems* destruction. But there may be another sense likewise given of the place, not a whit less probable or proper, taking the word *עֲוֹבִין* in holy Scripture phrase, *And except those days had been shortned*, that is, the days of *Jerusalems* destruction, *no flesh*, that is *not one Jew had been saved*, but they had all eternally perished. For as long as their Temple stood, and the *Jewish* Sacrifices and Ceremonies remained, it was such a stumbling block to the whole Nation, that almost all did stumble at it, neither were they few who for that very cause and scruple became *Apostates* from the *Christian* faith, which they had once imbraced, supposing the Old Religion to be the truer, because God permitted their Temple and Sacrifices to continue, of the certain and short destruction and abolishment whereof they had been taught in the *Christian* faith. For which cause also, as well as for their Persecutions sake, the *Author* of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* seems to exhort them, c. 10. v. 25. *that they would not forsake their Assemblies, as the manner of some was, but that they would exhort one another [to stand stedfast in the faith] and that so much the more, because they saw the day approaching, that is, the day of decurtation, the day of the destruction of Jerusalem, and desolation of the Temple drawing nigh ; for so that*

that day here and elsewhere, as also *the coming of the Lord*, and *the end of all things* do all relate unto the Destruction of *Jerusalem*. Because therefore *God* had his *Elect* among them, whom he would have saved, that this stumbling stone might be taken away, it pleased him to hasten the day of his coming, and to cut short the time of the Destruction and desolation of *Jerusalem*.

V. 28. *Wheresoever the Carcase is, there will the Eagles be gathered together.* You have the same Proverbial speech, *Job c. 39. v. 30. Where the slain are there is she*, meaning *the Eagle*. And here I cannot but take notice of the happiness of his exposition, who gives this meaning of the place. The Carcase is the *Jews* who lay dead in their sins, and by the *Eagles* are meant the *Roman Armies*, who for every Legion bore two *Eagles* for their Ensign, so that the word *Eagles* became often used by *Poets* and *Historians* for the *Roman Armies*, Nath. Ward. And in my opinion this seems to agree much more with the scope of the place, then that of others who liken our *Saviour* to a dead carcase, on which *Christians* like ravenous *Eagles* should make their prey. For to speak plainly. Quid hoc ad Rhombum? *What is this to the purpose?* But as it is easie to add to what already is invented, we may perhaps with better reason suppose that by this Car-

case may be meant the *Jewish State and Government*, which now by reason of the many distractions among themselves, and their oppression under the *Roman* power, lay plainly dead as is a *Carcase*. And so as *Eagles* and Birds of prey do usually out of a supernatural sagacity follow Armies in expectation of the prey of the dead bodies after the fight, so should the *Roman Armies* prefigured in those *Eagles*, whose pourtraictures they carried in their Banners, be gathered together in that place, where the *Jewish State* lay now as dead and helpless as is a *Carcase*, in hope and expectation of the spoil. And so our *Saviour*, Luk. c. 17. v. 37. the Disciples asking *where?* expressly answers, *Where the body is, thither will the Eagles be gathered together.* Particularly denoting the place where those things of which he spake before should happen, to wit, the desolation and sudden destruction of the *Jews*, which could be no where else but in *Jerusalem*.

C. 26. v. 12. Πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με. Ad sepeliendum me, *She did it for my burial.* More properly, ad funerandum, *she did it for my funeral.* So Mark c. 14. v. 8. Περιέλαβε με εἰς τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸ ἐνταφιασθόν, Antevertit tempus ungendi corpus mecum ad funus, it should be also rendred, *She is come aforehand to Anoint my body to its funeral, and not unto its burying.* For in the *Glossary*,

ἐνταφιασθόν

ἐνταφιάζω, is *funero*, and ἐνταφιασμός doth properly signifie the *Rites of funerals*, and ταφὴ *burial*. For in the Rites of funeration they did use to anoint the dead body with Aromatick Spices and Oyntments, before they buried them. And so was it the *Jewish* custom to perform their funerals, *Joh. c. 19. v. 40.*

C. 27. v. 3. Ἀπέστρεψε. This word is used here in the *Hebrews Hiphil*, for כִּשְׁבָה, redire fecit, *he caused to return*, and so in our *English* dialect might be properly and Significantly Translated, *He returned the Thirty pieces of Silver to the High Priests*. In which sense the same word is used before, c. 26. v. 52. Ἀποστρέφον σου τὴν μάχαιραν, *Return thy Sword into its place.*

V. 9, 10. Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἱερემίην τῷ προφῆτῃ λέγοντι, καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριῶντα ἀργύρια, (τῷ πωλῷ τῷ πεπικνωμένῳ ὃν ἐπιμήσαντο,) ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸ ἄρσεν τῷ κεραμέως, κατὰ συνήτητα μὲν ὁ κέρι. As to the name of *Jeremy* I suppose it is a mistake, or slip of oversight or memory. As to the words in General, which as they are commonly Translated, do by no means agree with one another, methinks as now distinguished in the *Greek* do most perfectly answer each to other. For our *Evangelist* doth not entirely or precisely cite either *Greek* or *Hebrew*, but renders only the sense which

which perfectly agrees with that of *Zachary* c. 11. v. 13. The words being expounded according as here the points are varied, without disturbing the construction (as it is in all Translations now disturb'd) or common reading, and that word for word neither rendring more or less then is in the *Greek*. Et accipi Triginta argenteos (pretium æstimati quem æstimarunt) à filiis Israel, qui vel & illi dederunt eos pro agro figuli, quemadmodum præcepit mihi dominus, *And I took* [in the first Person and Singular Number] *the Thirty pieces of Silver,* (*the price of him that was prized*) *of the children of Israel, who, or and they gave them for the potters field, as the Lord commanded me.* That is, [to make the construction agree] *I took,* and not as formerly *they took the Thirty pieces of Silver of the children of Israel as the Lord commanded me, and they gave them for the potters field.* The words in the *Parenthesis* being only appositive to the words going immediately before. And thus the construction is salved, the incoherence avoided, and the sense cleared. Those words, *As the Lord commanded me,* rightly answering to ἐλάβον, in the first Person of the Singular Number, as the Prophet *Zachary* also reads, c. 11. v. 13. *And the Lord said unto me, &c. καὶ ἐλάβον, And I took the Thirty pieces of Silver and cast them* [as it is here in *Matth.* said immediately before, that

Judas

Judas cast them down in the Temple] *eis*
 τὸ οἶκον κυρίου *eis* τὸ χωνόθυρον, in domo do-
 mini pro conflatorio, *into the house of the*
Lord for the Potters Forge, by the same Li-
 cence that Interpreters Translate *eis* by, in
 this very place, *eis* τὸ ἀγρὸν τῆ κεραμέως, pro
 agro figuli, *for the Potters field*, that is, that
 the Children of Israel, to wit, the Chief
 Priests might give them for the Potters
 field, as it is expressly said, they did, v. 7.
 That the word *εἰς* is and may be thus used and
 interpreted is abundantly common, though
 rarely observed. You may take these few
 examples in this place instead of many, Luk.
 c. 15. v. 15. Καὶ πωροῦθεις, ἐκολλήθη ἐνὶ τῷ πι-
 λιτῷ τῇ χώρᾳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἐπεμψεν αὐτὸν, that
 is, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπεμψεν αὐτὸν, as the English ren-
 der it, *And he went and joyned himself to a*
Citizen of that Country and he sent him into
his fields, though Beza Translate it, Qui mi-
 sit eum, *Who sent him*. Ruth c. 1. v. 11.
 Μὴ ἐπὶ μὲν υἱοὶ ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου, καὶ ἔσονται
 ὑμῖν *eis* ἀνδρες; Nunquid ultra mihi filii in
 ventre meo, qui erunt vobis in viros? *Are*
there yet any more Sons in my womb that, or
who may be your husbands? or and shall they
 be your husbands? In which place it seems to
 be an *Hebraism*, for the Hebrew reads, והיו.
 And you may find the like, 2 Kings c. 23.
 v. 29. ויגלך המלך יאשיהו לקראתו וימיתו במור.
 Et abiit Rex Josiah in occursum ejus qui, or
 &

& ille occidit eum in Megiddo, *And King Josiah went against him, who, or and he slew him in Megiddo*, that is Pharaoh Necho slew him. You may see the same phrase in later writers, Ἐὐθὺς γὰρ ἐν ἀγοραίοις λέγεις, ὡς ἄνδρες Λατίνοι, καὶ ἐστὶν ἀνοικεῖον, Statim enim in proæmio dicis, O viri Latini, quod est inassuetum, *For thou saist immediately in thy proem, O men of Rome, which is unusual, or not familiar, Sgurop.* You have it also in Plutarch in his Timoleon, Ἐδείκνυντο τοῖς στρατιώταις καὶ εἰς προσευχὰς τοῖς θεῶν ἐπέφοντο, Monstrarunt eas militibus, qui vel & illi ad precandum deos conversi sunt, *They shewed them the souldiers, who, or and they turned to supplicate their Gods.* See likewise, Mark c. 1. v. 9. and 10. Acts c. 6. v. 6. John c. 15. v. 6.

ANNOTATIONS

ON

S. Mark.

Ch. 3. v. 19, 20, 21.

K Αἱ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον, καὶ συνέρχεται
 πάλιν ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτὸς
 μήτε ἄρτον φάγειν, καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ
 παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν,
 ἔλεγον γὰρ, ὅτι ἐξέστη. By the most received
 Translations *Jesus* is said to be *besides him-
 self*. An Interpretation (if it be lawful so to
 speak) unbeseeming the sacredness of his Per-
 son, especially when a more probable one may
 be given. Thus, *Et veniunt in domum, &
 convenit iterum turba, adeo ut ne panem qui-
 dem edere possent, & audientes quidam ab eo
 exiverunt, ut eam sisterent, dicebant enim quod
 insaniret, And they went into an house, and
 the multitude cometh together again, so that
 they could not so much as eat bread, and some
 hearing of it went out from him, to stay it,
 for they said, it was mad. To wit, the mul-
 titude*

titute was mad, which for the vehement desire they had to come near to *Jesus*, did so violently press upon them, that they could not eat their Bread. For αὐτὸν is not a *relative* to αὐτῷ, as generally it is made, but to ὁχλῷ, and κρατῆται doth frequently signifie, *cohibere, or sistere, to restrain or to stay*. Ἀκούσαντες οἱ may be by a common trajection either οἱ ἀκούσαντες, *some hearing of it*, or οἱ παρ' αὐτῷ ἀκούοντες, *and some from him when they heard it*, that is, that the multitude was so mad to press unto him, went out to stay them, as οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ with the Grammarians are nuncii tui, or abs te missi, *Your Messengers or some sent for you*. Besides, *Jesus* was within the house, so that it cannot be fitly said, that they who heard it went out of the house to hold Him that was within the house. And to say that his Kindred went out of their dwellings to hold him, is neither proper nor probable, for how could the fame of the peoples thronging him, or the news of his being besides himself, come so suddenly to them, that they could so soon meet together? And if this perchance might possibly have been, ἐξῆλθον; *advenerunt, they came*, had been much more proper then ἐξῆλθον, *exiverunt they went out*, which is the Genuine signification of the word, notwithstanding the learned Beza in-deavours to maintain the other by examples that truly move not my faith at all, it being

more

more credible with me, that the *Evangelist* spake in the common dialect rather than in an unwonted phrase, especially when the sense agreeth with the context. And I cannot but extreemly wonder, why Learned men do so much labour to explode this interpretation (when the common one is so deservedly misliked) which agrees with the sense, construction, custom of speech, and what is more then all, with the *Parallel* places in *Matth.* c. 12. v. 23. and *Luke* c. 11. v. 14. so perfectly as nothing can do more. For in *Matth.* it is expressly said in the very word, sense, place and time as all agree, ἐξίσαντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι, obstupuit tota turba, that is, as *Beza* interprets it, *for admiration were besides themselves*; or as we render it, *were amazed*. In this place, ἐξέστη, the multitude was beside it self, or mad. In *Luke*, Καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι. Mirata est turba, *And the people wondred*. When therefore the sense agrees punctually in all Three *Evangelists* with all the circumstances relating to the story, as you may there compare, what man can reasonably doubt but one and the same word ought to be understood and to relate in *Mark* as it doth in *Matthew*, there being only this difference, *Matthew* hath ἐξίσαντο in the *Passive* voice in the *Plural*, and *Mark* ἐξέστη in the *Singular* Number in the *Active* voice. Both whom *Luke* interprets in a word *Synonymous*

nymous. For in *Hesych.* and *Phavor.* you shall find ἐξέστω, ἐθαύμασον, ἐξεπλάγητω. So as the one place must in all reason be an *Expositor* to the other, which mention all the same time, place and thing.

V. 29, 30. Ὁς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄρεσιν εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα, ἀλλ' ἐνοχός· ἐστὶν αἰωνίᾳ κρίσει, Ὁπ' ἔλεγον, πνεῦμα ἀκαθάρτων ἔχει. Οὐκ ἔχει, the present for the future, as in *Matth.* c. 26. v. 18. *ὡς* or *ποιῶ* *πάχα*, I will keep the Passover at thy house, ἐνοχός, is surely more, then, in danger, as it is exprest in the *English*, for its possible to scape from danger, but he shall never have forgiveness, neither in this world nor in that to come, *Matth.* 12. v. 32. It were better therefore rendred guilty of, or subject to eternal damnation, ἐνοχός, ῥεῶσιν, ὑποκείμενός, *Hesych.* The sense of the whole is this, Because they said he had an unclean spirit, therefore our Saviour tells them, that whosoever sinneth against the holy Ghost, shall never have forgiveness but is guilty of eternal damnation, that is, bound to suffer eternal judgment. For their sin was therefore unpardonable, because they said it of set malice, who when they could not but acknowledge that the miracles he wrought were done by the operation of the power of the divine spirit, did notwithstanding against the very dictates of the holy Spirit to their conscience say, *he did them by the Devil,* and by

by the Prince of the Devils, meerly out of spight, to the end they might turn away the people from following of him. Ενοχ^{ος}, Obligatus, Ενοχή, Obligatio, Gloss. Vet.

C. 4. v. 29. Όταν ὁ καρπὸς, Cum autem se tradat fructus, But when the fruit offers or shews it self, that is, ready to be reaped. For it is not properly called fructus, fruit, dum fruendo sit paratus, till it be ready to be reaped and gathered into the barn, as Varro and Donatus observe: Then doth a man immediately put in his sickle, for the harvest is come. Καρπὸς, παρὰ τὸ καρπῶ, τὸ ξηραίνω, ὅς δηλαδὴ πεπανθεὶς ἥδε κάρφεται μηκέτι αὐξήσῃ, ὕψ^{ος} ἐπὶ ῥοῇ, Phavor. Καρπὸς, Fruit, comes of καρπῶ, which signifies to dry, which being ripe is so dry as that it will grow no more with any wet. So that properly the corn, is not called fruit, till it be so ripe, that it will grow no more, and then tis time for the Husbandman to put in his Sickle.

C. 7. v. 9. Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε, Ye fairly reject the commandment of God. It is spoken, καταχρηστικῶς, abusively, by way of Irony. Or it may be read with an interrogation, καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε πῶς ἐντολῶν τῶ θεοῦ; And he said unto them, Do ye well to reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition?

C. 9. v. 12. Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν φεῶν ἀποκαθιστᾷ πάντα, καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τῷ υἱὲν τῶ ἀνθρώπου,

ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα πολλά παθῇ καὶ ἐξυδενωθῇ, Elias quidem veniens primo consummat omnia, etiam, quomodo scriptum est de filio hominis, ut multa patiatur & pro nihilo habeatur, *Elias verily coming first finisheth all things, even, as it is written of the son of man, that he may suffer many things and be set at nought.* Concerning ἀποκρίσας, see Matth. c. 17. v. 11.

V. 22, 23, 24. Ἀλλ' εἰ π δύνασαι, βοήθησον ἡμῖν ἀλαλχυνιδεῖς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. Ο' ὃ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ εἰ δύνασαι; πιστεῦσαι, πάντα δύναται τῷ πιστεύοντι. Interpreters in this place for the most part pass by the article τὸ, in which methinks there is an *Emphasis* by no means to be pretermitted. That therefore the *Emphasis* may not be lost, neither the *Syntax* violated, I would have the words distinguished as above and Translated thus, Ἀλλ' εἰ π δύνασαι, &c. Sed si quid potes, succurre nobis miserescens nostri, Jesus vero dixit ei, τὸ εἰ δύνασαι; si potes? crede tu, omnia credenti possibile, *But if thou canst do anything, have compassion on us and help us. But Jesus said unto him, If thou canst? do thou believe, all things are possible to him that believeth.* Τὸ is here taken materialiter or τεχνικῶς, and supposeth the matter whereof it was spoken, and that was a question of the power of Christ. For the Father having before brought his son to his Disciples who could not heal him,

him, *ὅτι τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν*, because of their unbelief, as our Saviour tells them *Matth. c. 17. v. 14.* doubted probably whether Christ himself could do it, and therefore put the question to him, *εἰ τι δύνασαι*, if thou canst do any thing, for thy Disciples cannot, have compassion on us. Whereto our Saviour replies shortly by way of *objurgation* or *exprobration*, as it were upbraiding his incredulity with indignation: as if he should say, What dost thou doubt whether I can or no? dost thou say, if thou canst? believe thou, and despair not of my power, for all things are possible to be done for him that believeth. They are the words of our Saviour to the Centurion, *As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee*, *Matth. 8. 13.* see the like *c. 9. v. 22,* and *29.* and elsewhere. And that this is so; the following words do strongly argue. For immediately the Father of the child being struck with the Reprehension, cried out and said with tears, *Lord I believe, help my unbelief.* It was the only time that ever question was made to Christ of his power by any who came to be healed of him, whose common address was, *Κύριε εἰάν θέλῃς δυνάσαι με καθαρίσαι*, Lord if thou wilt thou canst make me clean, *Matth. c. 8. v. 2.* or as it is *v. 8.* *Speak the word only, and my Servant shall be healed.* No question of his power, but they implored his will, and therefore no

marvail at all, if *Christ* upbraided here the Father of the child for his incredulity. Π-
 εῦσαι according to the *accent*, may be either
 the first *Aorist* of the *Imperative* mood of
 the *middle voice*, or the *Infinitive* of the
Active, understanding θέλε or μέμνησο, as is
 often frequent.

C. 11. v. 13. 'Ου γὰρ ὥσπερ οὐκ ἦν, Non-
 dum enim erat tempus ficuum, *For the time*
of Figs was not yet. If ever that *famous Per-*
son said any thing to the purpose, certainly
 his emendation here is very opportune, by
 changing of the accents, the aspirate into a dence
 (for the accent is not of the *Author*) and
 reading, ἔ γὰρ ὥ, and understanding ὥ, which
 is so very frequent, Ubi enim erat, erat tempus
 Ficuum, *For where he was, was the time of*
Figs. And so this History doth perfectly
 square, if applied to the *Jews*, of whom it
 was reasonable for *God* to expect some fruit,
 if from any place in the world, for there, was
 even an inexcusable time for Fruit. But it
 had been very hard for Our *Saviour* to have
 curst the innocent Tree, if in that place at
 that time had not been the time of Figs.
 Surely neither time nor place was wanting to
 the *Jews*. Neither can I find in any *Author*
 Sacred or Prophane, that ὡς ever signified
 a fruitful year, as some would have it, so as
 it might be lawfully Translated, Non fuit
 tempus ferax Ficuum, *It was not a fruitful*
time

time of Figs, or according to our English phrase, It was not a Fig year. And yet suppose this to be granted, it had not been less hard to have cursed the Tree, when it was not a seasonable year, than if it had not yet been the time of Figs.

C. 12. v. 40. *Οἱ κατεδιόντες τὰς οἰκίας.* Beza saith, *there is a Solacism in these words, and that to make construction between these and the former words, it ought to have been in the Genitive case, τῶν κατεδιόντων καὶ δεσποχυμῶν.* But surely there is no such cause or necessity. For it is an ordinary *Elleipsis*, frequent almost in every Page, to understand the verb εἶναι. Thus βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γεαυμάτων &c. οἱ κατεδιόντες εἰσιν, *Beware of the Scribes which love to go in long clothing, who devour widows houses and for a pretence make long prayers.* You may find the like Luke c. 6. v. 13. Καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν, where you must likewise understand ὧν. *And of them he chose Twelve.* And Act. c. 24. v. 5. *Ευρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα τῶτον,* where εἶμεν is to be understood, *For we have found this man.* You shall have it likewise in the Hebrew, Psal. 4. v. 6. *רבים אמרו, πολλοὶ λέγουσιν, multi dicunt, many say, multi dicentes.* Pagnin.

C. 14. v. 3. Καὶ συντρέψασα τὸ ἀλάβαστρον, *And having shook the cruse together, she poured it on his head.* The common version is

by no means proper, *And having broke the box, &c.* For if she had broke the vessel whatever it was, how could she have poured it on his head, but most if not all of it had been spilt? Neither is it said in *Matth.* that *she brake it.* Concussit therefore, or conquassavit, *She took or jogged it together,* either that the oyle or oyntment might give the more pleasing and fragrant smell, or that she might be the surer to pour out all, and let nothing stick to the bottom. For in the *old Glossary,* σωτρίβω is concutio, and in *Phavor.* σωτρίβει, σωθλᾶ, conquassat, that is, *shakes together.* Ἀλαβαστρον is ἀλχθ μὴ ἔχον λαβας, *A vessel which hath no ears or handle whereby to take hold of it.* Such as are at this day our *Fars* of Oyle: from a *privative* and λαμβάνω, *To take hold of:* or ἀμπύθη μύρε, *Vas olearium, or Ampulla unguentaria,* such as we commonly call a *cruise.*

ANNOTATIONS

ON

S. Luke.

Ch. i. v. 54, 55.

TH E S E two verses as they are Translated in the *English*, may pass for good construction, but then, to express the proper meaning of the place, these words, [*as he spake to our Fathers*] must be included in a Parenthesis alone, the words following [*to Abraham and his seed for ever*] relating necessarily to [*by remembering his mercy.*] Thus, *He hath holpen his servant Israel by remembering his mercy (as he spake to our Fathers) to Abraham and to his seed for ever. That is, by remembering his mercy to Abraham, and to his seed for ever, as he spake to our Fathers. And not as he spake to our Fathers, to Abraham and to his seed for ever. As if [to Abraham] were oppositive to [Fathers] as the Parenthesis implies in the Greek Edition, and the Translation in the Latin.* Which though

it seem a very nicety, yet is it such a *Solacism* in all Translations especially in the *Latin*, that I cannot but wonder at the inadvertency of former times, I may say stupidity, that could possibly couple τὸς πατέρας and τῷ Ἀβραάμ the *Accusative* and the *Ablative* together, as if τῷ Ἀβραάμ were oppositive to τὸς πατέρας, having little to salve the Irregularity of the construction, but by saying, that *Luke varied his form of speech*, that is in plain terms, he writ incongruously, when in truth he is acknowledged by all Expositors too knowing in the *Greek* to commit such a *Solacism*. Infallibly therefore the words must be pointed thus. Ἀνελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, μνησθῆναι ἐλέους (καθὼς ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν) τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Et sublevavit filium suum Israel, reminiscendo misericordiam (ut locutus est ad patres nostros) Abrahamo & semini ejus in æternum. The very words for more abundant confirmation are almost verbatim taken out of the last chapter of *Micah* the last verse. Δώσῃς εἰς ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ἰακώβ, ἐλεον τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὅτι ὥμωσας τοῖς πατέρας ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἐμμεροδεν, Dabis veritatem Jacob, misericordiam Abraham, quæ juraisti patribus nostris à diebus antiquis, Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham which thou hast sworn unto our Fathers from the days of old.

The

The very thing is now fulfilled by remem-
bring his mercy to Abraham and to his seed
for ever, which was before foretold, to wit,
the calling of the Gentiles, *Psal.* 98. v. 3.
Ἐμνήσθη ἐλέους τῷ Ἰακώβ, &c. Recordatus est
misericordiæ suæ Jacobo, &c. He hath re-
membred his mercy to Jacob, and his truth
toward the house of Israel, all the ends of the
earth have seen the Salvation of our God.
Δωσὶ εἰς, in Micah, no question was σφάλμα
ἡγεμιγραφεύου, a fault of the Transcriber, for
δύσας which agreeth with the Hebrew, and
the verb ὠργους, *Furasti*, in the second per-
son, which immediately follows.

C. 2. v. 34, 35. Ἴδὲ ἔτι καὶ εἰς πῶσιν καὶ
ἀνάσιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἰς σημεῖον
ἀντιπληρόμενον (καὶ σε ὃ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διε-
λόμεναι ῥομφαία) ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐν
πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοῖς, Behold this child
is set for the fall and rising again of many in
Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken a-
gainst (yea a sword shall pierce through thy
soul) that the thoughts of many hearts may
be revealed. And to this reading are confor-
mable all Interpreters. But there is no per-
fect agreement among them in the meaning
of the Parenthesis. Some interpret it of a
Sword of sorrow that should pierce the Mo-
thers heart, when she saw the bitter passion
of her Son; others of a Sword of diffidence,
that strook her through the heart, that is,
she

she was overwhelmed with a distrust, that her Son should be the Son of God, when she saw him die, until she was by his Resurrection afterward restored and confirmed in her faith. Others of a *Sword of calumny and reproach*, which the unbelieving *Jews* did cast upon her Son, that did pierce her soul. And for the propriety of the *Metaphor* they have each *Interpreter* his precedent to his peculiar sense. But take which of the senses you please, they are not easily without some straining applicable to the scope of the place, and therefore the words seem to be abruptly interposed, being as it were severed with a *Parenthesis* from the context. And this hath made me with submission to conceive, there may be another reading and interpretation, which will better reconcile the sense, without any *Parenthesis* at all, in manner, thus, Ecce positus est hic in casum & resurrectionem multorum in Israel, & in signum cui contradicetur, & tui ipsius gladius pertransibit animam, ut revelentur multorum cordium cogitationes. Behold this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against, and even thy Sword shall pierce their soul, that the thoughts of many may be revealed. As if it were read by a familiar trajection. Καὶ σὺ ὃ ἀντὶς ῥομφαία πρὶν ψυχῇ διελεύσεται, ὅπως ἀν' ἀποχαλυφθῶσιν διαλογισμοί. And to speak ingenuously the

Tran-

Translation and the Syntax is as lawfull and as regular as the other, if not more proper. Whether the sense be fitter, I shall leave to indifferent judgments. It plainly and clearly runneth thus, *And that the thoughts of the hearts of many may be discovered, even thy Sword shall pierce their soul.* That is, the word of God that shall proceed out of thy mouth, which shall be more penetrating then the sharpest Sword, shall pierce through the souls of many, so that it shall reveal the inmost secrets of their hearts. So *Heb. c. 4. v. 12.* Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐνεργῆς, καὶ τομῶτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν διςμοῖον, &c. Sermo dei vivus & efficax, & acutior gladio qui binas habet acies, &c. *For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper then a two edged Sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and a discernor of the thoughts and intentions of the heart.* So, as we have here in *Heb. μάχαιραν διςμοῖον*, a two edged Sword, have we, *Revel. c. 1. v. 16.* A sharp two edged Sword, and *c. 19. v. 15.* ῥομφαία ὀξεία, a sharp Sword, the very word used in this place, which as *Grotius* saith, is Evangelicus sermo ex Christi ore proficiscens qui intimo penetrat, &c. *The Evangelical word proceeding out of the mouth of Christ which penetrates the inmost parts, and discerns not only our actions, but our very thoughts whether good*

or

or evil. So *Ephes. c. 6. v. 17.* We have the *Sword of the spirit which is the word of God.* And what marvel if the Mother of our Lord with this *Sword of the Spirit* which is the word of *God* proceeding out of her mouth should so pierce the hearts of many, as that they should be forced to disclose the inmost secrets of their hearts, by confessing of their sins and acknowledging the ignorance of their ways? Who can question, but that *Divine Canticle* of hers, I mean her *Magnificat*, did melt and pierce the souls of all that heard it? And to confirm the propriety of the *Metaphor* in this sense, We have a *Tongue that's like a sharp Raser*, *Psal. 52. v. 2.* and words that were drawn *Swords*, *Psal. 55. v. 21.* and a *Tongue that's a sharp Sword*, *Psal. 57. v. 4.*

C. 3. v. 19, 20. Καὶ πρὸ πάντων, &c. And beyond all the Evils which Herod had done, he added yet this above all, πρὸ πάντων θέλει, *Præ omnibus cupere, To desire above all things.* *Dion. Halic.*

V. 23. Καὶ αὐτὸς, ὡς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τεράκοντα ἀρχόμενος ὢν, &c. These words seem to me to be rendred most significantly by trajection, as if it were read, Καὶ ὡς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τεράκοντα, αὐτὸς ἀρχόμενος ὢν, &c. And *Jesus was about Thirty years of age, he himself beginning, being (as was supposed) the Son of Joseph, &c.* ἀρχόμενος ὢν.

ἀρχήν βιβλὸν γενέσεως, beginning his Genealogy, to wit, on his Fathers side by reckoning upward, as *Matthew* recounted that on his Mothers side by reckoning downward, where he was ἔσχατ^{ος} the last. For it is not properly or significantly said that *Jesus began* to be *about* such an age, it being either tautologous or dubious. For, π^ερὶ ὥσει, About, signifieth a time indefinite, either above or under such a time. As for such trajections, they are most abundantly frequent, as you may see, *Animad. Act. 13. 27. 2 Cor. 4. 4. 1 Pet. 3. 21.*

C. 5. v. 14. *And he charged him to tell no man, but go and shew thy self, &c.* That there is an incoherence in the construction of these words, is evident enough. And yet in the *Greek* the sense and Syntax are both good, and so may be also rendred in the *English*. Καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ, μηδενὶ εἰπῆν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν, &c. *And he charged him, remember, or see thou tell no man, but go and shew thy self to the Priest.* By a common *Elleipsis* the words θάλας or μέμνησο are to be understood before, εἰπῆν. As it is in the *Parallel story*, in *Math. c. 8. v. 4. ὅσα μηδενὶ εἶπης*, or as the same phrase is Translated in the *English*, *Act. c. 23 v. 22. Παραγγείλας, μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα, &c. having charged him, see thou tell no man, that thou hast shewed these things unto me.* See *Act. c. 1. v. 4. C. 6.*

C. 6. v. 35. Καὶ δανείζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες. Tis true the common version suites well enough with the place. Et mutuum date nihil inde sperantes, *And lend hoping for nothing again.* But tis as true, which Beza saith, that the word ἀπελπίζειν in this signification is not to be found in any *Author*, and therefore I conceive tis fit to use another, which as to the sense suits with the Context well enough, but is much more agreeable to the dialect of the *Greeks*. With whom ἀπελπίζειν doth frequently signifie in the *Hebrews* *Hiphil*, desperare facere, *to make desperate.* In which sense the *Syriack*, *Arabic*, and *Persian Interpreters* seem all to have understood it, whereof the last most properly reads, *Ne quempiam desperabundum faciatis*, as if it had been written in the *Greek* with an *Apostrophe*, Μηδέν' ἀπελπιζοντες, *Neminem desperare facientes*, *Love your enemies*, and do good and lend causing no man to despair. And in this sense may you find the word, *Isai. c. 29. v. 19.* Οἱ ἀπελπισμένοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐμπληθήσονται εὐφροσύνης, *Desperati homines implebuntur lætitia*, *Desperate men shall be fill'd with gladness.* And *Ecclesiast. c. 27. v. 24.* Ὁ ὃ ἀποκαλύψας μυστήρια ἀπάλπισεν, *Qui autem denudavit mysteria desperavit, i. e. desperare fecit*, *He that hath revealed secrets makes men to despair of him*, as it is in the *Roman Edition*; and in *Stephanus*, Ἀπελπιζον τοῖς

τοῖς γονεῦσι τῷ ἐπείνοδον, Desperare faciens Pa-
rentes reditum, *Causing his Parents to despair*
of his return. And so we have in *Pliny lib.*
22. cap. 24. Vulnera desperantia, *Wounds that*
make the Chirurgion to despair the cure. And
this I take to be the proper reading and Ge-
nuine signification in this place, Μηδέν ἀπελ-
πίζοντες, Neminem desperare facientes, *Causing*
no man to despair.

C. 7. v. 30. Τῷ βουλῇ τῷ θεῷ ἐθέτοσαν εἰς
ἑαυτὲς, Spreverunt voluntatem dei erga se-
metipsos, *By a frequent trajection, But the*
Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the will of God
toward themselves, who would have had them
called to repentance by the Preaching and
Baptism of *John the Baptist.* Βουλῇ, γνώμη,
θέλημα, *Hesych.*

C. 11. v. 41. Πλὴν πᾶς ἐνόντα δοτε ἐλεη-
μοσύνην, καὶ ἰδὲ πάντα καθαρά ὑμῶν ἔσιν. I
cannot but differ from *Interpreters* in the Tran-
slation and meaning of these words, which I
rather render thus, Immo quæ insunt date E-
leemosynam, & ecce omnia vobis erunt munda,
But give you the things that are within
for alms, and behold all shall be clean unto you,
Ἐνεσιν ἀντι τῷ ἐντός ἐσιν, and ἐνεῖς ὀρθόμηνος,
Phau. And this sense the scope of the place
requires. For in allusion to what is said be-
fore, τὸ ἔσθθαι and πᾶς ἐνόντα signifie one and
the same thing, and so doth πᾶς ὀρθός in the
Parallel place in *Matthew c. 23. v. 26.* Κα-
θαρίσας

θάλειτον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τῆς ποτηρίου, ἵνα γίνῃται καὶ τὸ ἐντὸς αὐτῆς καθαρόν, Purga prius quod intus est poculi, ut id quoque quod extra est fiat purum, *Clean first that which is within the cup*, that is as here, *Give you first the things that are within for alms, that the outside may be clean also*, that is also as is here, and behold all shall be clean unto you, the sense requiring the same interpretation in both places being Parallel. So as τὰ ἐνόντα must necessarily be Translated here as τὸ ἐντὸς is there. The meaning of the place being thus, Ye Pharisees make a fair shew without, ye make long Prayers and perhaps ye give alms to the poor openly in the streets, but *within ye are full of rapine and extortion*. If therefore ye will that all ye have be clean in the eyes of God, give to the poor for alms, all the goods you have gotten by rapine and extortion, τὰ ἑσθθεν and τὰ ἐνόντα, these secret ill got goods which lye hid within from the eyes of men, this is truly to purge the inside of the pot, and then that *which is without shall be clean unto you*. Indefinitely whatever is within, the inside of the cup is thoroughly to be cleansed, that is to say, all they had got by rapine and extortion, were to be given to the poor in alms. Yet not so, that the bare restitution of their ill got goods was alone satisfactory: No, but until they did refund in alms (for it was impossible

possible to make a restitution to every man of his own,) all which they had got by evil means, nothing they should give or offer unto God would be accepted of him, but that whatever it were he would account it as unclean; but as soon as they had bestowed all their ill got goods in alms unto the poor, then τὰ ἔξω and τὰ πάντα *the things without, and all the rest they had should be clean* before the Lord, so that whatever they offered to him afterward should be pleasing and acceptable to him. And this I conceive to be the proper meaning of this place; for it were a very faint command for our Saviour to bid them, to give of such things as they had, it matters not how little, in comparison of bestowing all their ill got goods in alms.

C. 12. v. 49. Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω; εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη, Ignem veni mittere in terram, & quid volo? utinam jam accensus esset, *I am come to send fire on the earth, and what would I? O that it were already kindled. But I have a Baptism to be Baptized with, and how am I streightened until it be accomplished? It is the speech of a troubled mind, the parallel whereof you may see Joh. 12. 27. Now is my soul troubled, καὶ τί εἶπω; and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour, ὅλῃα ἔξ τούτου, but for this cause came I to this hour, Father glorifie thy name.* He checks himself in either place, εἰ
F with

with the LXX is of the same force as *utrumque*, Num. 22. 29. Jos. 7. 7. and elsewhere, *ἵλυρ* is the fire of Persecution which began with *Jesus*.

C. 13. v. 33. "Ὁν οὐκ ὀδύχεται, &c. For it may not, or cannot be that a Prophet perish out of Jerusalem. And in this acception of the word is *ὀδύχεται* very frequent in Epictetus, 'Επί τι ὀδύχεται τῷ σωλῶνι ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἔχειν τὸ φῶς, ὀδύχεται ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου, It may be the Moon hath her light from herself, it may be from the Sun, whom Lucretius interpreteeth accordingly,

*Lunaq; sine nothofertur loca lumine lustrant;
Sive suam proprio jactat de corpore lucem.*

And that it could not be otherwise but all the Prophets must perish in Jerusalem, Drusus hath observed, that the Prophets were not judged but by the Judges in the Sanhedrim, who always had their residence in Jerusalem, in a publick house, such as is our Convocation or Chapter house. And so it immediately follows, O Jerusalem, Jerusalem which killest the Prophets, &c.

C. 15. v. 4. Τις ἀνθρώπων ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχει ἑκατὶν πρόβατα ἢ ἀπολέσας ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἢ πάλαι περὶ τὰ ἐννενηκονταεντία, ὅτι τῇ ἑρμῇ ἢ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπώλωλος, What man of you having an hundred Sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not he leave the Ninety and Nine,

and goeth after that which is lost in the Wilderness, until he find it. This trajection is familiar, and so we distinguish and read, Mat. c. 18. v. 12. He leaveth the Ninety and Nine; ἐν τα ὄρη πορεύεται, and goeth into the Mountains and seeketh that which is lost. The desert wherein John Baptist lived and taught, Mat. c. 3. v. 1. is called ἡ ἐρημία τῆς Ἰουδαίας, and Luk. c. 1. v. 39. ἡ ὄρειν; montana, wherein Zachary did dwell.

C. 18. v. 7. Καὶ μακροθυμήσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. Understand, ἔσται, as the Old Latin seems to have done, & *patientiam habebit*? ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, may be Translated two several ways. If you understand the *Elect*, then it must be *Propter illos*, & *patientiam habebit diu propter illos*? And shall he long have patience for them? ἐν with a Dative doth sometimes signify, For, Scot. But if by αὐτοῖς you understand, their *adversaries*, as it may well be, for the Widow desired the Judge to avenge her of her Adversary, v. 3. and so I suppose they understood it, who Translate, In longum differet iram in illos? Shall he long defer his anger toward them? then must you Translate, And shall he long have patience towards them, that is towards the *Adversaries* of the *Elect*, as we Translate, Ecclesiast. c. 35. v. 18. Οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμίῃ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Κεχατός, Neither will the mighty be patient toward them, meaning the unmerciful and

Heathen which are forthwith in the same verse mentioned. That the verb ²¹ in all its *Moods* and *Tenses* is frequently understood, see *Ani-mad.* on *Mar.* c. 12. v. 40.

V. 8. Πάλιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔλθων ἀεὶ
 δὲρσιν τῶν πίων ἐπὶ τῇ γῆς, Verum cum filius
 hominis venerit, inveniet hanc fidem in hac
 terra? But when the Son of man cometh shall
 he find this, that is, such a faith in this land
 [of Judea?] For so ἡ γῆ is often understood
 in Scripture, τῶν for πάντων, and τῇ for τάν-
 τας. As is before observed, *Matth.* c. 11. v. 9.
 The sense is, When the Son of man cometh
 to the destruction of *Jerusalem*, shall he find
 such a Faith in the Land, as shall importune
 God with its prayers, as did the troublesome
 or importunate *Widow* who never left the un-
 just Judge till he had avenged her? a faith
 which shall pray and never faint, according to
 which he commanded his disciples to pray
 in the beginning of the chapter. Neither is
 there any other commodious interpretation of
 the words. You have likewise, τῆς for τάν-
 τας visibly and expressly, c. 21. v. 23. Ἐσται
 γὰρ ἀνάστυς μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῇ γῆς, καὶ ὀργὴ ἐν τῷ λαῷ
 τῷ τῷ, Erit enim pressura magna in hac terra,
 & ira in populo isto, For there shall be great
 distress in this land and wrath upon this peo-
 ple.

C. 22. v. 20. Τὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἢ καὶ
 λαβήκη ἐν τῇ αἵματι μου τὸ ὡς ὑμῶν ἐκχυ-
 μῶσι,

μυρον, *This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you.* But this Translation makes a gross Solæcism in the Greek, whereof I would not willingly allow our Evangelist to be guilty. For in *my blood which is shed for you* implies that τὸ ἐκχυρόμενον relates to αὐματι the *Nominative* to the *Dative*, which in Syntax is by no means to be allowed; neither do I think our Evangelist did more intend to joyn τῷ αὐματί μου, and τὸ ἐκχυρόμενον, here, then he did to couple τὴς πατι-
 eas, and τῷ Ἀβραάμ, c. i. v. 55. So that I cannot but admire with admiration, when the Excellent De Dieu is so confident in saying, *Et si τὸ ἐκχυρόμενον casu differat à τῷ αὐματι dubium tamen non est, quin cum eo sit construendum, neque ullus hic præterea Solæcismus statuendus.* And to prove that this construction is no Solæcism he produceth these examples following, where an *Oblique* case may be turned into a *Nominative*; Eph. c. 3. v. 17, and 18. Κατοικῆσαι ἡμεῖς ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἑπὶ ζόμῳι, &c. for ἑπὶ ζόμῳι, &c. But there as Beza rightly tells you, ἑπὶ ζόμῳι, &c. doth most properly agree with the verb ἐξισχύετε, *in* being to be construed by *trajection*, *Ut in charitate radicati & fundati possitis assqui, &c. That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, that ye being rooted and grounded in love may be able to comprehend, &c.* as it is in our English,

and *Joh. c. 1. v. 14.* Ἐθαπαύμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενὺς πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος, &c. for πλήρης. But that construction is much better salved by the ordinary Parenthesis, as it is in *Rob. Steph. Curcellanus, the Old Latin, and our English.* And lastly *Apoc. c. 1. v. 4, and 5.* Ἀπὸ τοῦ, ὁ ὢν, &c. and ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς, &c. For which construction there may be this reasonable account, ἀπὸ τοῦ, ὁ ὢν, ὁ ὢν, ab eo, qui est nomine, ὁ ὢν, & à Jesu Christo, qui nomine est, ὁ μάρτυς, From him who is by name, *Who is, and who was, and who is to come, and from Jesus Christ, who is by name, The faithful witness, &c.* like as when we say according to *Drusus, Augustinus in de Civitate dei, for in libris de Civitate dei.* Besides this is a singular expression in *S^t John,* and will not serve however to justify such an irregularity in *S^t Luke,* who by all is acknowledged to be generally learned, and not unskilful in the *Greek,* τὸ ἑλληνικὸν ὅσα ἀπει-
 ρω. *Sop^ron,* τὴν ἐξω σοφίαν πολὺν, *Theophil.* so that if there be any way to reconcile the Construction and the Sense I would choose That rather than to fasten such a *Barbarism* on our *Evangelist,* which truly I conceive may be done by saying, there is a σφάλμα γραμματικόν, *vitium scriptoris, a fault in the transcriber,* the like fault whereunto we do admit in other places, and that instead of π,

it should have been written, 'Ο ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυώμενον, *This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you*, and this supposition makes the construction regular, and is but a light mistake, unless you will say that τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυώμενον is appositive to τὸ τοῦ ποτήριον. And then Translate it thus, *This cup which is poured forth for you* [in token of my blood which is to be shed for the remission of your sins] *is, or doth signify the New Testament in my blood.* Neither is this exposition or sense so harsh and difficult, but it may be fairly admitted and understood.

V. 32. Καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τὴν ἀδελφεάν σου. I confess that the Passive is often taken for the Active in the New Testament, and sometimes, though much more seldom, the Active for the Passive, but why it should be taken in this place I see no necessity at all, especially when the proper interpretation of ἐπιστρέψας in the Active sense doth on the contrary better agree with the scope of the place. Thus, *The Lord said unto Peter, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired thee to sift thee as wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not. And when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren.* As if he should say, *As I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail, when Satan shall tempt thee, so do thou likewise,*

wise, when thou hast converted any of thy brethren to the faith, pray for them, i. e. confirm them or strengthen them by thy prayers, that their faith may not fail, when Satan shall tempt them. As if it were read, Καὶ σὺ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας τὸς ἀδελφούς σου στήριξον αὐτούς, which word αὐτούς is to be understood, or ἀδελφούς σου to be repeated, a form of speech extremely frequent. You have it in the very preceding verse but even now mentioned, Ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς, τῷ σινιάσῃ ὡς τὸ αἶτον, i. e. τῷ σινιάσῃ ὑμᾶς ὡς τὸ αἶτον, and in the 54. following, Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον, for ἤγαγον αὐτὸν, *Then took they him and led him, &c.* See *Animad. Act. 13. 27.* According to the common Translation, it should have been written properly in the Passive voyce, Καὶ σὺ ποτε ἐπιστρέψῃς, *And thou when thou art converted.* Neither doth it seem at all fit to say, *And thou one day when thou shalt be converted,* who was already before converted, though he afterward fell, as our Saviour had foretold him. Neither I think will any man fix the moment of *Peters* conversion in the crowing of the cock, if any do, τὸ, ποτε, One day, is said in vain, for that word intimates a more distant time, then the space of a few hours, or minutes.

A N N O.

ANNOTATIONS

O N

S. John.

Ch. 5. v. 4.

Oὁν πρῶτον ἐμβὰς, *Whoever then first after the troubling of the waters stepped in was healed, or made whole of whatsoever disease he had.* Many things concurred faith learned Grotius, that this should not be thought any natural kind of healing by the water. And I conceive this alone to be argument enough, That none was healed but he who first stepped in after the troubling of the waters. One only was healed by one only moving of the waters. If the cure had been by a natural cause, why were not more healed then one at the same time? But certainly there was something supernatural in this matter, the reason whereof it is not necessary for us to know. It is enough for us that we are assured of the truth by *Evangelical Authority.*

Ch. 7.

Ch. 7. v. 22. *Moses therefore*, Δια τῆτο Μωσῆς δέδωκεν, &c. Certainly these words & τῆτο, ought to have been severed by a distinction to the former. Thus, Καί πάντες θαυμάζετε & τῆτο. Μωσῆς δέδωκεν, &c. Unum opus feci, & omnes miramini propter illud. *Moses dedit vobis circumcisionem*, &c. *I have done one work and ye all wonder because of it. Moses gave you Circumcision*, &c. And so is the sense perfect without any *Solacism*, neither is there any need of any disquisition concerning the unusualness of the phrase or in-consequence of the words. The Verb θαυμάζειν being familiarly used in our sense with a *Preposition*, as Mar. c. 6. v. 6. Ἐθαύμασον & τῶ απισίαν αὐτῶν, Et mirabatur propter incredulitatem eorum, *He marvelled because of their unbelief*. And so elsewhere.

C. 8. v. 4. Ἐπε υποφώρῳ μοιχευομένη, *This woman was taken in Adultery in the very act*. The *Syriack* reads aperte. But in my opinion it should be rather written with an *Apoptrophe*, ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ, and Translated thus, *Hæc mulier deprehensa est in sui ipsius conspectu Adulterans*, *This woman was taken committing Adultery in her own very sight*. So openly that she cannot with any face deny it. The word cometh from αὐτός and the *Praterperfect* tense of the Verb εἶδον, παρὰ εαυγῇ. So saith *Phavorinus*, Ἐπ' αὐτόπῳ, ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ, and αὐτόφωρῳ, ὁ ὕψ' αὐτῇ ἐλεγχόμενος

μῦθος ὃς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὤν, Qui à seipso redarguitur, & conspectus est, *He who is convicted and seen of himself.*

C. 11, v. 10. Ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ, Quia lux non est in eo, *that is, in mundo, Because there is no light in it, that is, in the world.* Not, in him, as is commonly rendred, which agreeth not with common sense. But thus it is perfect sense and construction both. *If any man walketh in the day he stumbleth not,* Ὅτι τὸ φῶς τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ βλέπει, *Because he seeth the light of the world, but if a man walketh in the night, he stumbleth,* Ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ, *because there is no light in it, that is, relating to the foregoing word, in the world.* He doth closely reprehend his disciples by a Parable, who stumbled at the mention of his going up to Jerusalem, telling them they ought not to stumble as long as he who was the light of the world was in the world, c. 9. v. 5. but when he should be taken out of the world, it would be no marvel if they stumbled, and therefore he exhorts them, c. 12. v. 35. *To walk while they have light, lest darkness should come upon them, for yet a little while the light was with them, and he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.* Or thus, The disciples stumbled or were offended, when he said *let us go up to Jerusalem.* The reason was they walked in the night of infidelity and ignorance,

rance, for they would not, or did not understand that our Lord should suffer. As it is likewise said *Luk. c. 18. v. 34.* When Jesus said unto them, *behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things shall be perfected which are written by the Prophets of the Son of man, &c.* They understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken. They dreamed so of a temporal Kingdom, that they could by no means understand that our Lord should suffer, whom they expected to be a King to restore the Kingdom of Israel.

V. 33. *Ενεβριμύνατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐταράχεν ἑαυτὸν, He groaned in his spirit, which troubled him.* The conjunction καὶ is frequently so to be interpreted in the New Testament, as you may see, *Animad. 15. 6. 20. 18. Apocal. 1. 6.* According to the Hebrew Idiom, as Beza saith, which while Interpreters do not observe, they often trouble the Syntax and the sense, as in this very place: for certainly it is not good sense to say, *He groaned in the spirit and troubled himself.* But to say *his spirit troubled him*, is all one with that, 13. 21. *ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, he was troubled in his spirit.*

V. 39. *Τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, For he hath been dead Four days.* Rasis the Arabick Physician hath left it written, as I have it from Quistorpius, *That it was ordained by a law, that no*
Apo-

Apoplecticks, who foamed about the mouth should be buried, till after 72 hours, and considering the reason he declares it to be an excellent law, because all the humours had perfected and finished their motions in Three days, that is in 72 hours, which term of the motion of the humours being once finished, there is no more of life to be expected. And from hence he infers, that Jesus Christ did not raise up Lazarus again to life till he had been Four days dead, that there might be no place of objection left to the speculation of any Naturalist, who, if he had been raised within the 72 hours, would have denied it to be a Miracle.

C. 13. v. 10. Ὁ λευμνύθη εἰς χρεῖαν ἔχει ἢ τὰς πόδας νίψας, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ καθαρός ὅλος, *He that is washed needeth not to have even his feet wash'd, but is clean every whit.* For what need can there be pretended to wash his feet, who hath been before washed all over from head to foot, yet to follow his discourse, which notwithstanding was besides his purpose which he intended in the washing of his disciples feet, he farther telleth them, *But ye are not all clean, for he knew who it was that should betray him.* His principle meaning was to teach them Humility by his example as is evident by the Context.

C. 15. v. 6. Ἐάν τις μένη ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλήμα καὶ ἐξηρανθῇ, Si quis
in

in me non maneat projicitur foras ut palmes qui exaruit, *If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch which is withered.* And thus it is intire and perfect sense, neither is the construction or Translation at all new or unusual, though the want of the thought thereof hath puzzled most Interpreters in the rendering of this place. Our very *Evangelist* hath the same manner of speech, c. 20. v. 18. Ὁν ἰώσαυε τὸ κύριον καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ, *Quod vidisset dominum qui ea sibi dixisset, That she had seen the Lord who had spoken these things unto her.* And Luk. c. 15. v. 15. Καὶ πορεύεις ἐχολώθη ἐν τῷ πολιτῷ τὸν χωρὸν ἐκείνης καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτόν, *Abiit igitur & adhæsit uni ex civibus regionis illius qui misit eum in agrum, And he went and joyned himself to a Citizen of that Country who sent him into his fields to feed swine.* And Act. c. 6. v. 6. Οὓς ἐστησαν ἐναντίον τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας, *Quos statuerunt in conspectu Apostolorum qui adhibitis precibus imposuerunt eis manus, Whom they set before the Apostles who when they had prayed layd their hands on them.* In all which places Beza renders καὶ, *Qui*, bringing on this last place in his Annotations two examples of the same phrase, the one out of *Mark* c. 1. v. 10. the other out of *Plutarch*. For more abundant satisfaction, see note on *Matth.* c. 27. v. 9, 10. and *Act.* c. 7. v. 10.

V. 20. Εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδιδόξαν, καὶ ὑμεῖς δουλεύετε, αἱ

τὸ ῥῆγον μὲν ἐτήρησαν καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν τῶν τῶν τῶν. The word τῶν without doubt in this place, ought not to be taken, for to keep or observe, simply, but rather to be understood in the worser sense, and seems to be used for ὡς-ταρῶν infidiosè observare, that is *to watch*, with intention to intrap, as it is said, Luk. 14.

1. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν ὡς-ταρῶν αὐτὸν, *And they watched him*, Ut captarent quod in eo reprehenderent, as *Stephanus* observes. And 20.

20. Καὶ ὡς-ταρῶντες ἀπέστειλαν, &c. *And they watched him and sent forth spies*, that they might take hold of his words. And that this

is the meaning of ἐτήρησαν and τῶν τῶν in this place, the joyning of εἰ ἐτήρησαν with εἰ ἐδί-ξαν, makes very probable, but the whole sense together beginning from the 18 verse doth e-vince it clearly. Εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὡς-ταρῶν μοι, &c.

If the World hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you, &c. Remember the word that I said unto you, 13. 16. the servant is not greater then the Lord, if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you, if they have watched my sayings, they will also watch yours, But all these things will they do unto you for my Name sake. Certainly all in the worser sense, They will persecute you, they will treacherously watch your words for my Names sake, that they may catch somewhat out thereof, whereof so accuse you, as they have done to me, for the Servants is not above the Lord.

If

If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household so? Matth. 10. 25. Neither is the use of this word *τηρεῖν* for to watch or to observe in the same sense insolent at all, as you may see in *Stephanus*. You shall find it bears much the like sense, *Ecclesiast.* 11. 4. *Τηρεῖν ἀνέμῳ ὡς ἀνέμῳ*, He that observes the wind, shall not sow, *שֹׁמֵר רוּחַ לֹא יִטֵּעַ*. In which sense you have the word *שֹׁמֵר* often in the Old Testament, and somewhat more to our purpose. As *Psal.* 56. 7. *יִשְׁמְרוּ יְרֵכִי*, They shall watch or observe my steps, *Calcaneum meum observabunt*, *Τὴν πτέρναν μου φυλάξουσιν*. A word Synonymous to *τηρήσασθαι*. And 71. 11. *וְשֹׁמְרֵי נַפְשִׁי*, Et observationes animæ meæ, *Καὶ οἱ φυλάσσοντες τὴν ψυχὴν μου*, And they that lay wait for my soul consult together. In both which places it might have been lawfully Translated *τηρήσασθαι* and *προϋῶντες* instead of *φυλάξουσιν* and *φυλάσσοντες*.

C. 16. v. 26. *Ἐν ὁρίῳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου αἰτήσατε, καὶ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτῶ τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν*, In that day ye shall ask in my Name, and not, I say unto you, because I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you, &c. I say unto you, intervenes by way of Parenthesis, and answers in effect to both members of the speech. As if he should have said, I say unto you, in that day ye shall ask the Father in my

my name, and he shall hear you, not because I will pray him for you, but because he himself loved you, for that ye have loved me, and have believed that I came from God.

V. 30. Νῦν οἶδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα καὶ ἐχρείαν ἔχεις ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτῇ, ὃν ἰστέω πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες, Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee, by this we believe that thou camest forth from God. If any man ask, What means [And needest not that any man should ask thee.] Let him but look back to the 19 verse, where tis said that Jesus knew his disciples were desirous to ask him, although they inquired only among themselves, what it meant, that he said unto them, Yet a little while and ye shall see me, &c. For this therefore do they now say that they did believe that he came forth from God, because he knew what they intended in their thoughts, and therefore needed not that they should ask him any question. Θεὸς γὰρ εἰδέναι τὰ κρυπτὰ καὶ καρδίας, For it is God alone that knoweth the secrets of the heart.

C. 18. v. 17, and 25. Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν; Nonne & tu ex discipulis es hominis istius? Art not thou also one of this mans disciples? μὴ, nonne.

C. 20. v. 17. Μὴ μου ἅπτου, Jesus said unto Mary, Touch me not. What can be the meaning of that? Matth. c. 28. v. 9. Ἐ-

G

κατάπαν

καὶ ἔμωον αὐτὸς τοῖς πόδας, *They held his feet.* After the Resurrection. They must needs therefore touch him, which *Thomas* also might have done, v. 27. The *Old Latin* therefore not willing an argument should be drawn from the words next following, that he would not be touch't, doth prudently and very rightly include them in a *Parenthesis* and so Connects *noli me tangere* with *vade autem ad fratres meos, &c.* *Meddle not*, as may be more significantly rendred, *with me*, (*for I am not yet ascended to my Father.*) But go unto my Brethren and say unto them, *I ascend unto my Father and your Father, &c.* As if he should say, he would not have her stay any longer in embracing of him, or meddling with him, but that she should forthwith go unto the Disciples and comfort them, who no doubt were dismaied, by telling them, that he was not yet ascended, but that he would shortly ascend to their Father and his, and to their God and his. Then which there never was a more comfortable Message, all circumstances considered.

C. 21. v. 22. *If I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee?* And by this speech he did plainly intimate, that *John* should remain alive till in truth he should come, as in very deed he did, to wit, to the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and Thirty years after, if we may believe *Historians* and *Chronologers*, in which

which number also they are to be reckoned; *Matth. c. 16. v. 28.* who *Jesus* saith *should not tast of death*, though then standing by; *till they saw the Son of man coming in his Kingdom.* The Destruction of *Jerusalem* being frequently understood by the coming of *Christ.* Which notwithstanding was not at that time known. For *there went out a saying among the Brethren that this Disciple should not die.* And so *Tertullian*, misled with this error, affirmed, *That they were deceived in their hope who expected that John should remain alive until the coming of the Lord; O- biit enim & Johannes, For John was also dead.* For he understood not those words of the coming of the *Lord* in his Kingdom to take vengeance of the *Jews* by the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, but of his last coming in the day of Judgment, and in that sense he said *they were deceived of their hopes.*

ANNOTATIONS

ON

The Acts.

Ch. i. v. 4.

K A'I αναλίζοντες. The proper interpretation of this word is to be fetch't out of the parallel place in *S^t Lukes Gospel*, c. 24. v. 26. *Gr.* Where he relates the same continued story, which immediately preceded the Ascension of our *Lord*, varying only the circumstances and words. How *Jesus* after his Resurrection. that he might take away all doubting out of the minds of his Disciples, who *believed they saw a spirit*, when he appeared to them, *after that he had shewed them his hands and feet to feel*, and yet they would not believe; for a most certain argument of his Resurrection, that they should no longer think they saw a Vision or Spirit, he ask't them *if they had any thing to eat*, and when they had given him part of a *hony comb and a broiled fish*, he did eat before them,

them, and at the very same place and time whilst he was eating with them, he said unto them, Behold I will send the promise of my Father unto you. And by this argument, saith S^t Chrysostom, the Apostles did always assert the truth of his Resurrection, and therefore Peter, as he hath it, πρῶτον ὅτι τὴν ἀνάστασιν, when he would gain faith to the Resurrection, useth the same argument, Act. c. 10. v. 41. How God raised him up the third day, and shewed him to us, who did eat and drink with him after he was risen from the dead. So as I think we may with confidence resolve, that the true interpretation of σιναλιζόμενον in this place is that of the Old Latin Interpreter, that is, Convescens, whilst he was eating together with them. For he repeateth here all the rest of the same things, which he had commanded in his Gospel at the same place and time. Ibid. Παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωριζέσθαι, ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἣν ἠκούσατε, μὲν. These words as I conceive may be more truly Translated being thus distinguished without any supplement or breach of Syntax, and yet with a more commodious sense in this manner, Præcepit eis. Nolite ab Hierosolyma discedere, sed expectate promissionem patris, quam audistis, mei, He charged them, remember or see ye depart not from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of my Father which ye have heard of me. You have the very

same sense, almost the words in the Parallel place in his Gospel, c. 24. v. 49. *And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from above.* By a most familiar *Elleipsis* the *Infinitive* is put for the *Imperative*, understanding θέλετε or μέμνησθε, or the like before χωρίζεσθαι and ἀμεινύνειν. Examples whereof are frequent in Heathen Authors, especially in *Phocylides* almost in every verse,

Μὴ πλετεῖν ἀδίκως ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐρίων εἰσotόθεν.
Ἀρκείῃς παρέσσι καὶ ἄλλοτριῶν ἀπέχεσθαι,
Πᾶσι δίκην νέμειν, &c.

Ne ditescas injustè sed ex justè partis vive.
Esto contentus præsentibus & ab alienis abstine,
Omnibus justa tribue.

Wax not rich unjustly but live of well got goods.
Be content with present, abstain from other mens,
Give every one his due.

You have the very like in Sacred writ and that often, *Act.* c. 23. v. 22. Παρεγγείλας, μνησθὲν ὁκλαδῆται, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς με.
Where the English reads, And charged him, see thou tell no man that thou hast shewed these things to me. And this version the sense and Syntax do in both places necessarily require. So you have *Rom.* c. 12. v. 14, 15. Ἐυλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταραζέσθαι, χαίρειν μετὰ χαίροντων, καὶ κλαίειν μετὰ κλαίωντων, Benedicite & ne imprecemini, gaudete cum gaudentibus, & flete cum

cum flentibus, *Bless and curse not, rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep.* See *Ruth* c. i. v. 6. *Matth.* c. 5. v. 39. *Luk.* c. 5. v. 14. *Act.* c. 23. v. 24. And in many other places. As for the particle *με*, I conceive it is more suitably, as without doubt it is more regularly, rendred in this place, *The promise of my Father which you have heard*, because *τῷ ἐπαγγελίαν τῷ πατρὶός μου*, are the very words our *Evangelist* useth in the Parallel place in his Gospel, much rather then, *The promise of the Father which ye have heard of me*, as usually they do with a most violent construction. Whereas the trajection is most common and familiar.

V. 25. *Σὺ Κύριε καρδιογνώστα πάντων, ἀνάβητον ἐν τῶν τῶν δύο ἑνα, ὃν ἐξελέξω λαβεῖν τὸ κληῖρον τὸ δαχμονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς, ἐξ ἧς παρέβη Ἰudas, πορεύμεθα εἰς τὸ τόπον τὸ ἴδιον.* That is, *εἰς τὸ τόπον τὸ ἴδιον τῷ Ἰούδα*, or *εἰς τὸ τόπον αὐτοῦ*. And that *ἴδιον* may be taken here for *ἀντὶ* *Oecumenius* teacheth clearly in his Exposition on these words, *Τόπον ὃ ἴδιον, ἥτοι ἀλγόνως καλεῖ, &c.* ἢ ὅτι, τῷ Ἰούδα ἐξαποσμύγει, ὅτι ἴδιον χρεὶν τῷ ἐκείνῳ λαμβάνων ἐπισκοπῶ. His proper place, he either calls the strangling [whereof *Judas* died] or because *Judas* being fallen, he had his place who took his Bishoprick, for it cannot be imagined what *ἴδιον* can possibly signifie in this place of *Oecumenius*, but *ἴδιον τόπον, locum e-*

jus, his place into which *Matthias* was to succeed, that is the *Apostleship* of *Judas* from which he was by transgression fallen. As out of this very place *Clarius* hath animadverted on these words, *In locum suum, si ad Judam referas, videtur intelligere laqueum quo se dignum judicavit ob proditionem, sin ad Matthiam, intellige Episcopatum cui successit.* Unto his place, if you look on *Judas*, it seems to mean the halter whereof he thought himself worthy for his treachery, if on *Matthias*, understand the *Bishoprick* into which he succeeded, that is *Judas* his *Apostleship*, for they were not then ordained *Bishops*. So *Cicero* doth most frequently use *suus* instead of *ejus*, and that in imitation of the *Greeks*, as *Budaeus* saith, for, *suus, non modo ἢ ἰδιον εἰαυτῷ, sed etiam ἢ ἰδιον significat & utroque modo apud Græcos accipitur ut οἱ σέπissime pro sibi & pro ei*, Bud. Com. pag. 28. So that the Translation is properly this, *Thou Lord who knowest the hearts of all, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen to take part of this Ministry and Apostleship, from which Judas is by transgression fallen, that he may enter into his place.* That is, that he whom thou hast chosen may succeed into the place of *Judas* his *Apostleship*, Πορὸν ἑωαί eis ἢ τόπον is the same phrase with πορὸν εἰς τὰ κτήματα in *Demosthenes*, which *Budaeus* interprets *Hereditatem adire*. For in *Cicero*, *Hereditatem adire* is *hereditatem*

tatem subire or *suscipere*, To enter upon or to take upon one the inheritance, as our Holyoak hath well observed. And this interpretation seems to be more reasonable, then that of their's who interpret it of Judas, as if S^t Luke should mean, that he was gone to his own or to his proper place, to wit, as they would have it, unto Hell. Tis true, no man can make other judgment. But I cannot for all that think the *Evangelist* had any such meaning in these words, I rather with *Chrysostom* look upon, Το φιλόσοφον τὸ ἀνδρὸς, πῶς οὐκ ὑβρίζει, &c. The prudence of the man, how he speaks not contumeliously nor insultis, &c. Which plainly argues that he thought not, that it was the meaning of S^t Luke in these words to adjudge Judas into Hell, For what could he have said of Judas more contumelious, then that he was gone to his own place, meaning Hell? Neither was it the business of an *Historian* or *Evangelist* to interpose his own opinion, but rather to leave Judas to the judgment of God, it being enough for him to have related matter of fact, as he had promised and professed to do in the beginning of his Gospel. Καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται, &c. Even as they had delivered things unto us who were eye-witnesses from the beginning, &c. But who will you say was an eye-witness of Judas his going to or being in Hell?

C. 2. v. 27. Ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυ-
 χὴν μου εἰς ᾅδου, οὐδὲ δώσεις τὴν ὁσίον σου εἰς
 διαφθοράν, Quoniam non derelinques animam
 meam in Hade, neque dabis sanctum tuum vi-
 dere corruptionem, *Because thou wilt not leave
 my soul in Hell, nor give thy holy one to see
 corruption.* The first branch of this verse
 seems to concern his Soul which was not left
 in the state of death, as other humane Souls.
 I say, left *in the state of death*, for it is not
 one and the same thing to *die*, or to *be dead*,
 and to *be* or to *remain in the state of death*,
 or if you please, as it is v. 24. Ἐν ταῖς ὥδισι
 τοῦ θανάτου, that is ἐν δεσμοῖς in vinculis, *in the
 bonds of death*, as Athanasius and Beza inter-
 pret the word; and so in the Psalmist, in the
 LXX ὥδινες and παγίδες are Synonymous, or
 in those receptacles where the Souls of the
 Godly are reserved till they receive their crown,
 as St Augustin; or in the middle of the shadow
 of death where the Souls of the dead are, as
 Irenaeus; or in Hades, or in Hell, whither
 we are taught by the Apostles Creed that
 he descended, or went into. Where by the way
 I cannot but observe, that our English Hell,
 comes from the Saxon HELAN, celare, te-
 gere, to hide or cover, so as it may be said
 to have the same signification with Hades,
 ᾅδης, αἰδης a place that cannot be seen, ἡμεῖον
 ἀφ' ἧς, locus sine luce. Phavor. or else in Pa-
 radise with the Soul of the Thief. All which
 several

Several expressions serve but to signifie one and the same thing. For I do not see but *Paradise* may very lawfully be interpreted a receptacle or separated place for departed Souls, from the *Hebrew* פֶּרֶד, separavit, locus separatus, or septum, a close, such as for pleasure and delight our Parks and Gardens are, from which cause this word hath obtained with the *Hebrews* the meaning of bliss and pleasure. And I cannot but think the *Greeks* borrowed the word from the *Hebrews*, and that neither of them owe it to the *Persian*. For though perchance (which yet is by no means certain) *Nehemiah* might borrow it from the *Persian*, who lived in the *Persian Court*, yet *Solomon* tis certain, which used the same word in *Ecclesiastes* and in *Canticles* many ages before *Nehemiah's* time, writ in the *Hebrew* tongue, neither is there any reason at all to think that he ever used the *Persian dialect*. Neither is such a termination with the *Hebrews* so unusual, with whom such *Anomalous* words are frequent, that we should so earnestly disown it, as their due. Neither doth the *Rabins* פֶּרֶד which signifies *death*, which is a *separation*, differ from our sense. Why should we therefore fly from the *Hebrew* to the *Persian*, and acknowledge him to be the true owner of the word? I confess I value the Authority of *Julius Pollux*, but I shall not swear unto it. However in summ I conceive it not unreason-

unreasonable to say, that the Godly who are in the *state of death*, are in *Paradise*, in what ever place secluded, and finally to conclude, that this first branch of the verse concerns only his Soul, as the latter plainly concerns his body, which saw no corruption as other human bodies do. And in this sense doth *Peter* expressly explain the words, v, 31. Ὁτι ἡ καρπλιφθῆ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ἅδου, ἐπεὶ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθορὰν, Non relicta est anima ejus in Hade, neque caro ejus vidit corruptionem, That his Soul was not left in Hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. Plainly distinguishing between his Soul and Body, as if he did it of set purpose, to the end that none should think this place concerned the Sepulchre or Grave of *Christ* alone, as some would have, that say, that *Hades* signifieth nothing else. For Perversissimum est, &c. as *Tertullian*, saith, lib. de Carne Christi. It is a most perverse thing, that naming the flesh, we should understand the Soul, or naming the Soul we should understand the flesh, The truth of their names is the safety of their properties. Neither doth *Athanasius* speak less plainly to our purpose. Οὐτε γὰρ θάνατος, &c. Neither did death prevail to subjugate his human nature so far as to detain it in its bonds, neither could corruption by any tyrannical invasion exercise its power to the putrefaction of his body. Humanæ ista lex necessitatis, &c. saith

saith Hilary, *It is a law of humane necessity, that the bodies being buried, the Souls descend into Hell, which descent the Lord himself did not refuse, to shew the truth of his manhood, or human nature.* And doubtless this is the scope of *Peters* words in this place, of purpose to prove the Resurrection of *Christ*, and that he was not left in the state of death as other mortals are. And this opinion I hold to be pious and consonant to faith. I believe the immortality of the Soul, I believe the Resurrection of the body, and its reunion with the Soul, and life everlasting, I am no friend to Purgatory, nor to any prayer, supplication or application to any *Saint*, save only to our sole Mediator *Jesus Christ*, who for that particular end ascended into *the holy of holies*, that is, into the *highest heavens*, that there he may commend our prayers to our *Father* which is in heaven; who from hence also conceive may be drawn a cogent argument, that prayers ought not to be made to *Saints*, whom Religion hath not yet placed in that *holy of holies*, to wit, *the highest heavens*, and so qualified for fitting *Mediators*. But there are not few and those no mean ones neither, who positively say, there is no receptacle of Souls, but affirm that the Souls of the Godly do immediately after their separation from their bodies go into heaven, that is to say, as I suppose, that heaven which is properly called
hea-

heaven. One of whose great Arguments is from that of *Luke c. 23. v. 43.* *Hodie eris mecum in Paradiso, Thou shalt be with me this day in Paradise.* But that day our Saviour was not in heaven, unless they speak and mean *equivocally*, for he was not yet ascended either in human Soul or Body, as far as Scripture doth, or reason can inform us. *Paradise* therefore must be some other place, namely, this *Hades* or *Hell*, as we Translate it, in which for a short time his Soul was held, to which he properly went, or may be said to have descended, and in which the same day together with his Soul was also the Soul of the Thief, where together with the rest of the Souls of the Godly that are departed (our Saviours only being delivered or loosened from its bonds the Third day) this Soul of the Thiefs doth rest till the last day of the Resurrection. *Ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ in horto Eden qui locus est receptaculum animarum post hanc vitam, Dru- sius ad locum, Lucæ c. 23. v. 43.* He speaks the same *lib. prateris. 3º. Paradisum à calo distingui, quod ille sit receptaculum animarum post vitam, calum autem recipiat omnes post judicium extremum.* They urge another argument from *S^t Ambrose*, *Christum introitu suo aperuisse credentibus regnum cælorum, That Christ by his entrance had opened the Kingdom of heaven to all believers.* Before which time the Fathers were not made partakers of the
the

the Promise, but that from the death and ascension of *Christ* they also ascended with him into heaven, and were there consummate and made perfect, as to their Souls which then were received into heaven, which before the Ascension of *Christ* were not ascended. In answer whereunto, I do truly acknowledge, but not in their sense, that *Christ* by his *Entrance* or *Ascension* into heaven did open the Kingdom heaven to all believers, which before was shut to all the world save only to the *Jews*, but since the time of his Passion and Ascension open to any one that strives to enter, so as its now lawful for all persons of all Nations to press into it, who shall believe in his Name. But to meet the argument, I beseech you, where were the Souls of the *Fathers* before they Ascended with *Christ* into heaven? For where ever they were, reason perswades it, and Scripture doth not deny it, in the same place was the Soul of *Christ*, and where was the Soul of *Christ* there was also the Soul of the *Thief*, They were not yet Ascended, Neither surely were they in a place of torment, for I cannot think it could be any comfort to the Thief, as I suppose, it was intended, if *Christ* should have told him that he should be that day with him in a place of torment, it must therefore be rationally concluded, that they were in some third place of rest. In which place if we affirm that

that the Souls of all the Godly departed remain till the last day, what danger is there, what incommodity? If we believe, I say, and believe no more, that there remains to all a Resurrection in the last day, both *Fathers* and us, in which day we with them shall be most perfectly consummate, and that in the mean while all the Souls of the Godly are in the hands of God, *εἰς τὸ ὀφειλόμενον αὐτοῖς τόπον*. In a place due and proper to them, as it is in the Epistle of Polycarpus to the *Philippians*. And all this while not a moment of time if compared with Eternity. Neither were the old Christians wont, as *Grotius* saith, to call this middle state of place and time between this life and the Resurrection, by the name of heaven. But I contain my self, this question requiring a longer and larger disquisition, then to be shut up in so narrow limits. And yet a question, which neither Scripture nor any general Council or Synod had ever yet explicitly determined for an Article of Faith, before the Convocation at *Dublin* 1615. Which did then indeed so define it. That after the end of this life the Souls of the Sons of God were immediately received into heaven, &c. Perhaps of purpose to meet with the *Romish* Purgatory. Neither should I have said thus much, but that many persons do so tenaciously maintain this last opinion for an Article of their Faith, that they condemn all who hold otherwise of impiety

piety and heresie. And that these words seemed to me so plain, that as it were they led me by the hand to the sense and meaning which I have here laid down, though rarely in that respect observed of any. I am very much pleased with the modesty of Calvin in this very argument, when speaking of the Souls of the faithful, and their place and state after this life, he saith, Valde se torquent multi, &c. *Many do very much trouble themselves in disputing what place departed Souls possess, and whether they enjoy a heavenly glory or not, But tis a rash and foolish thing to enquire farther or deeper of or in things unknown, then God hath permitted us to know.* And elsewhere upon that place of the Gospel aforementioned concerning the Thief and Paradise, De loco Paradisi curiosè & argutè disputandum non est, &c. *We must not dispute curiously or subtilly of the place of Paradise, let it suffice us who are ingrafted into the body of Christ by faith, that we shall be partakers of his life, and so after death enjoy a blessed and chearful rest, till that in the coming of Christ the perfect glory of a heavenly life shall solidly appear unto us.* In which opinion I do willingly acquiesce, conceiving that which I hold to be safe, Probable with Peter Martyr, agreeable to reason, and not disagreeable to Scripture.

V. 30. Τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσεται ἡ ἀρχὴ
 Ἡ Τὸ

Tò in this place is to be taken, *παρακαθίσας*, or as they say, materialiter, and denotes *the matter* of the oath which God sware unto David, that is, *ex fructu lumbi ipsius* τὸ ἀναστήσειν, *resurgere facturum Christum*, κατὰ σάρκα, *in carne ut sederet super solium ejus*, *That out of the fruit of his loyns he would raise up Christ in the flesh to sit upon his Throne.* And this is the τὸ ἐντεταμένον, *the very thing the Apostle seeks to prove*, to wit, *that Christ rose in the flesh*, which out of the Context is most evident and plain. For he seeing this before spake of the Resurrection of Christ, v. 31. and in the following verse it is positively affirmed, *That this Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are witnesses.* So that the word ἀναστήσειν, *raise up*, must not be understood de adventu Christi, *of the coming of Christ into the world*, as some would have it, but of his Resurrection; and so affirmeth Beza, τὸ ἀναστήσειν, *melius præsenti argumento quadrare*, si de Resurrectione Christi accipiat, *quam si ad Adventum referas*, *That, to raise up Christ doth better square with the present argument, if it be understood of his Resurrection than if you refer it to his Coming.* But if that word alone square better with the scope of the place, then doth it much more to raise him up κατὰ σάρκα *in the flesh*, it being the very thing which was to be proved. So as it cannot be denied, but it doth much obscure

the sense and scope of the words to say, that according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit upon his Throne: Κατὰ doth frequently signifie In; as κατὰ τὴν Αντιόχαν, in Antiochia. Act. c. 15. v. 23: κατὰ καιρὸν, in tempore, in due time. Rom. c. 5. v. 6. κατὰ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐν, Hefych. ἐμεινον κατὰ χώραν, manserant in loco, Phavor.

C. 3. v. 18, 19, 20. These three verses I suppose may better be distinguished and Translated thus, Ὁ ὁ θεὸς ὁ πορευθεὶς πᾶσι τοῖς σωμα-
 τῶν πάντων τῶν πορευθεὶς αὐτῷ, παθεῖν τὸ χριστόν,
 ἐπλήρωσεν ὑμῶν, (μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε
 εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας) ὅπως ἀν-
 ἔλθωσι καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ἀπὸ πορώσεως τῆς κυρίας,
 καὶ ἀποσταλῇ τὸ πορευθεὶς ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ χρι-
 στόν, ὃν δεῖ, &c. Deus autem secundum ea quæ
 prænuntiavit per os omnium prophetarum
 Christum perpassurum, implevit ita (pænite-
 mini igitur & convertimini ut deleantur pec-
 cata vestra) ut venerint tempora refrigerii ab
 ira domini, & miserit qui vobis prænunciatus
 est Jesum Christum, quem oportet cælum re-
 cipere, &c. But God according to what he had
 foretold by the mouth of all his Prophets that
 Christ should suffer, hath fulfilled so (repent ye
 therefore and be converted that your sins may
 be blotted out) that the days of refreshment
 from the anger of the Lord are come, and that
 he hath sent unto you who was before foretold
 of, Jesus Christ, Whom the heavens must re-

ceive, &c. These words by *postponing* of the Parenthesis to its proper place, according to our common way of speaking, are more clearly understood Thus. But God according to what he had foretold by the mouth of all his Prophets that Christ should suffer, hath fulfilled so that the days of refreshment or rest from the anger of the Lord are come, and that he hath sent unto you who was before foretold of Jesus Christ, whom the heaven must receive until the times of the consummation of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy Prophets, since the world began. Repent ye therefore and be converted that your sins may be blotted out. You have the like intervenient Parentheses in many places, as *Joh. c. i. v. 14. Luk. c. i. v. 55. c. 2. v. 34, 35.* and elsewhere, α, for α, a common Grecism, and so read the Syriack, and the *Aethiop. "Οπως αν, αντι τε ινα, Bud.* and so is it Translated often, as *Matth. c. 6. v. 5. "Οπως αν φανωσι, Ut appareant, That they may appear. Luk. c. 2. v. 35. "Οπως αν αποκαλυφθωσι, Ut revelentur, and elsewhere. Απο προσωπι, lawfully, ab ira domini, for הן in Hebrew signifies faciem and iram. αναψυξις, αναπαυσις, Hesych. αποκηρυγµδρον, prænuntiatum, rightly. Χρονων αποκαταστάσις, tempora consummationis. αποκατάστασις, πλείωσις, Hesych. and Phav. And so Occumenius, Αποκαταστῆναι δε φησι χ εἰς πέρας ἔλθειν ἅπαντα χ τίτε ἐλθούσεται,*

It behooves all things to be finished and brought to an end. See Matth. c. 17. v. 11.

C. 7. v. 4. Κακῆσθαι, μετα το θάνατον τῷ πατρί αὐτοῦ, μετακίνησεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆν νῦν, &c. Et inde postquam mortuus est pater ejus, transtulit illum in hanc terram in qua vos nunc habitatis, *And from thence after his Father was dead, he removed him into this land wherein ye now dwell.* It hath not a little troubled *Interpreters*, that *Stephen* should here say, that *God* removed *Abraham* out of *Charran* after the death of his Father, because it is said, *Gen. c. 12. v. 4.* That *Abraham* went out of *Charran* in the 75 year of his age, and c. 11. v. 26. that he was born in the 70 year of *Terah* his age, and v. 32. that *Terah* was 205 years old when he died. For from hence it follows that *Terah* overlived the departure of *Abraham* out of *Charran* 60 years. Therefore to untie this knot almost all our late *Chronologers* and *Interpreters*, all other opinions exploded, will have *Abraham* to be born in the 130 year of *Terahs* age, and not in the 70, as others of Ancient times have thought, for if to 130 years you add 75 which was the age of *Abraham* when he went out of *Charran*, you fall just into the true year of the death of *Terah*. And to make this opinion good, they say, it is not necessary that from *Gen. c. 11. v. 26.* it should be understood that *Abraham* was born in the 70

year of *Terah*, but that in that year *Terah* began to be a *Father*. For that it is not expressly said that *Abraham* was born in that year, but that *Terah* lived 70 years and begat *Abraham*, *Nahor*, and *Haran*, from whence they will not have it concluded that *Abraham* was the Eldest Brother, because first named, but say they, it is more likely he was the Youngest, and that for preheminencies sake only he was first named of *Moses*. And that they may make this opinion yet surer, they frame an argument out of their own *supposita*, whereby they think to fasten an absurdity upon those of another judgment. Thus, If *Abraham* were the Eldest Son, then *Sarah* his wife the Daughter to his Brother *Haran*, and but Ten years Younger then *Abraham*, Gen. c. 17. v. 17. must necessarily be born to *Haran* in the Eighth year of his age, which would be ridiculous to affirm. But to answer this argument in the first place. First, I see no cause to grant that *Sarah* was the Daughter of *Haran*. For that question is not yet resolv'd. For who that reads Gen. c. 20. v. 12, *Indeed she is my sister, she is the daughter of my Father, but not the daughter of my Mother*, will not confidently conclude that *Sarah* was the Sister of *Abraham* and the Daughter of *Terah*, but not by one and the same wife? especially such a Solemn affelevation being added, as if he had spoke it purposely

to free himself from the suspicion of speaking falsely. Whereupon *Hierome*, after another Exposition of the words first, addeth, Sed quia in Hebræo habet, Verè soror mea est, filia Patris mei, sed non filia Matris meæ, magis sonat quod Abrahæ soror fuit. In excusationem ejus dicimus, nec dum illo tempore tales nuptias esse prohibitas. But because it is in the Hebrew, Indeed she is my sister, she is the daughter of my Father, but not the daughter of my Mother, it sounds rather that she was Abrahams sister. We say for his excuse, that as yet such marriages were not prohibited. As also the Hebrew Doctors, among the six sorts of unjust copulations, reckon that for one, cum sorore uterina, with the sister by the Mother. Nay *Musculus* is yet more plain, Omnia hæc commenta simplicitas Hebraica respuit, quid est enim necesse torqueri in re tam clare expressa? &c. The Hebrew simplicity rejects all these devices, for what necessity is there to be troubled in a thing so clearly expressed? He saith, Indeed she is my sister, the daughter of my Father, and that she might not be thought to be of one and the same belly, he adds, and not the daughter of my Mother, so that it is manifest, that Sarah was born to Terah by another wife, then that of whom he had Abraham. To this may be added out of *Eusebius*, Ο ὁ Αβραάμ λεγόμενος πατὴρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν τῷ Σάρραι, H 4 Abra-

Abrahamus verò à Patre accipit uxorem suam Saram, *Abraham taketh his wife Sarah from his Father*, not from *Haran*. And by this appears that this question is not yet determined. But be it granted that *Sarah* was *Ischah* and the daughter of *Haran*, what hinders but *Abraham* might be born when *Haran* was Forty years of age? And then how easily might *Sarah* be the Daughter of *Haran*, and but Ten years Younger then *Abraham*, and no absurdity follow that *Haran* was but Eight years old when *Sarah* was born? For though the Scripture say, That *Terah* lived 70 years and begat *Abraham*, *Nahor* and *Haran*, it doth not therefore necessarily follow, that *Terah* at that time began to be a Father, no more then that *Terah* begat them all in that year, which I suppose no man will affirm; or that *Noah* began to be a Father, when he is said to have been *Five hundred years old*, and to have begotten, *Shem*, *Ham* and *Japhet*. But certainly it is much more probable, that *Terah* began to be a Father about the 30th year of his age, and about that time begat *Haran*, about which time his Progenitors began to be Fathers, and about which time our late Chronologers would have *Cainan* (whom *Luke* interposeth in his Genealogy) begin to be a Father. I say *Haran*, because he seemeth to be the Eldest Brother, if both *Nahor* and *Abraham* married his Daughters. But if *Haran*

ran were born to *Terah* in his Thirtieth year, it behooved him to be 40 years old when *Abraham* was born to *Terah* in his 70th, and if *Sarah* were born to *Haran* in the 50th year of his age, which it is lawful and fit enough to guess, then must she be Ninety years old when *Abraham* was an Hundred. So that the argument which would fix an absurdity upon Dissenters, falls to the ground either way. And of this opinion, which to me seems very probable and equal, *Fosephus* gave me the hint, *Antiq. Jud. lib. 1.* where he expressly affirms that *Abraham* was born in the 70th year of *Terah*, and afterwards apart, that he had to his brothers *Nahor* and *Haran*, without having any regard to their age, as being not material, and as if they might have been born at any other time, even before the 70th of their *Father*. For there is mention made of them only because they are named in the sequent History. And the same with Submission I suppose may in the like manner be understood of the *Patriarch Noah*, that is to say, that he begot *Shem* in the 500 year of his age, neither in that year began to be a *Father*, but that *Shem* had Brothers, *Faphet* and *Cham*, who might likewise have been born many years before the 500 year of *Noah*, named only *Gen. c. 5. v. 32.* because there is mention made of them in the following Story, as in the same manner are named

Na-

Nahor and Haran, Gen. c. 11. v. 26. My arguments for either opinion are these. First, It argues, that *Shem* was born in the 500 year of *Noah*, because it behooveth his age, as also that of *Abraham* to be fix't, in whose off-spring, *Tendens ad Abrahamum civitatis dei ordo dirigitur, The line of the City of God* [that is of his Church] *was to be directed down to Abraham.* As it is in *titulo c. 10. lib. 15. August. de Civit. Dei.* But it is objected, that *Shem* could not be born in the 500 year of *Noah*, because its said, *Gen. c. 11. v. 10.* That *Shem* was an Hundred years old, and begat *Arphaxad* Two years after the Floud, from whence they gather that *Noah* begat *Shem* in the Five Hundred and Second year of his age. Whereof *Scaliger* gave warning, *Can. Isag. lib. 3.* Sciant verò Studiosi quosdam biennium plus quam nos ab Adam ad Exodum putare, idque propter Natalem *Arphaxad*, qui contigerat anno secundo Diluvii. Nos non omisimus quidem illum annum, sed annum Quingentesimum Noæ, & Millesimum Sexcentissimum Quinquagesimum Sextum Diluvii currentes accipimus, But let Schollars know, that some do reckon two years more then we do from Adam to the going out of Ægypt, and that because of the Birth time of *Arphaxad*, which happened the second year of the Floud. We have not omitted that year, but we take the Five Hundreth year of *Noah*, and the Thousand, Six Hun.

Hundred Fifty and Sixth year of the Flood from the Creation of the World both current. For demonstration sake suppose, that *Noah* was born the first day of the first month (as all agree that he was born in the beginning of the year) and that in the Five Hundreth year of his age he begat *Shem*, perhaps Fourteen days before the year was fully ended, and then must *Shem* be an Hundred years old fourteen days before the Six Hundreth year of *Noah's* age was expired. So that when the Flood was dried up and *Noah* went out of the *Ark* in the Six Hundred and first year of his age, in the second month and the Seven and Twentieth day of the month, Gen. c. 8. v. 13, 14. then was *Shem* an Hundred years old, 14 days, one month and 27 days, that is, one Hundred years and 71 days old, on which Seven and Twentieth day if *Shem* did first begin (as it is reasonable and lawful enough to conjecture) to give his mind to the duty of Marriage after the Flood, then from that day within the space of 280 days, according to the time of life, might *Arphaxad* be born, unto which if you add 71, the remainder of the age of *Shem* after the Hundreth already reckoned, there will be in the whole 351, so that there will be still remaining of the Hundreth year of the age of *Shem* yet current, taking out 351 out of 365 days the whole space of a year, 14 days. And therefore

fore did not *Scaliger* unfitly take the 500 year of *Noah current*, and it is rightly said according to the plain letter of the *Scripture*, Et Semus erat Centum annorum filius & genuit Arphaxad secundo anno post Diluvium, *And Shem was an Hundred years old and begat Arphaxad the second year after the Flood.* But here they further object, that *Arphaxad* was born שנת'י, which they interpret, duobus annis, *two years* after the Flood. But what שנת'י means, I conceive the LXX did more rightly interpret δ'ατ'ιρς *et'us*, as also did *Augustin* and *Scaliger*, *secundo anno Diluvii*, or *post Diluvium*. For if from the Creation of the World to the Flood be reckoned 1656 years, as all confess according to *Hebrew account*, and from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*, suppose him to be born in the 70 year of *Terah*, 292, it is necessary, that the first year of those 292 years begin from the Flood beginning, or the beginning of the Flood, and consequently the 1657 year from the Creation of the World, in which we say *Arphaxad* was born, must of necessity be the second after the Flood. As to this proof it is the same though you admit *Abraham* to be born in the 130 year of *Terah*. So that *Scaliger* did neither unfitly take the year of the Flood also current. If any shall yet cavil at the interpretation of שנת'י, besides the very demonstration, he calls the judg-

judgment of the LXX, as also the judgement of those persons whom all ages must acknowledge to be learned, and the very use of speech with the *Hebrew* into question, with whom בן שנה' is *filius secundi anni*, that is a son who is in the compass of the second year of his age, with the *Latins* termed *bimus*, and with the *Greeks* διετής, whereof you may see note on *Matth. c. 2. v. 16*. But suppose the word be taken in the strict sence as they would have it, and be Translated two years after the *Flood*, why may not *Moses*, though *Arphaxad* was born within the space of two years complete, speak ὅσον ἀκεβῶς sed ὁλογεῶς *numero completo fortè posito pro fracto*, using a complete number perhaps for a broken one, ut etiam apud *Demosthenem* & *Plautum* talentum numerari videmus ubi non exiguus drachmarum numerus deest vel superest. Et vulgatissima est hæc numerandi κατὰ γενούς. And this is a common abuse of numbring, as *Scaliger* hath observed. And surely very frequent with *Moses* himself, for who can imagine that all the *Fathers* lived precisely whole years, no months, nor days over or under? What end is there then in so troubling the *Chronology* of the Church of God, and the distracting the letter of his Word, when it is so easie to demonstrate, that what the Scripture saith, might lawfully be done, and probably also was so? And if these things be
so,

so, how in the *second* place can it be said, that *Noah* began to be a *Father* in the 500 year of his age? For if *Shem* were born to *Noah* in his 500 year, and *Japhet* were the Eldest Brother, as do rightly Translate *Pagnin*, the LXX, and the *Chald. Paraph. Gen. c. 10. v. 24.* (rightly I say, for if *Moses* had intended *Shem* for the *Elder Brother*, he would surely have said אֲחִי הַנְּרוֹלִי יִפֶּת, and not אֲחִי יִפֶּת הַנְּרוֹלִי) and *Cham* also the Younger Son, as for the most part he is said to be, that is younger then *Japhet*, for *Shem* was the Youngest of all, which also among many others, *Josephus* doth confirm, *Antiq. Jud. lib. 1. c. 7.* Where he calleth *Shem*, תְּרִיטוֹן, the Third son of *Noah*. And *Schindler* also, a man of no vulgar judgment in holy matters, who saith in his *Pentagl.* in the word קִטָּן, that *Cham* was the second son of *Noah*, and *Shem* the youngest. How as I said before, can *Noah* be said to have began to be a *Father* in the 500 year of his age, when it appears so manifestly that *Japhet* and *Cham* must be born before? Neither is it credible, at least not probable, that he began not to be a *Father*, till his age began to decrease, and that he was made a Preacher of righteousness unto the perishing World; But it sounds much more likely, that he began to be a *Father* about the same time that his *Progenitors* began also to beget Sons, perhaps about the *Hundredth*

dreth and Eightieth year of his age, about which time *Methuselah* begat *Lamech*, and *Lamech* begat *Noah*, or perhaps enlarging the time, about the Two Hundreth or Three Hundreth year of his age. Neither, if *Noah* had begun to be a *Father* in the 500 year of his age, and *Shem* were his Third son, can it in any sense be said that *Shem* begat *Arphaxad* in the Hundreth year of his age, two years or the second year after the Flood, but Three years or in the third, unless we will say that all Three were born in the space of Two years, which were a strange thing to affirm. But to return to the matter it self. Their reasoning seems to me so far from reason, that I can by no means rest satisfied in it. For, *first*, whereas they would have *Abraham* to be born in the 130 year of *Terah*, hath little probability in it. For why should *Abraham* wonder so, as if his reason strove with his faith, that a child should be born to him that was an Hundred years old, if he had been born to his Father in the Hundreth and Thirtieth year of his age? But this objection they value not a straw, (although it be indeed ἀναντιστά.) They tell you the wonder of the *Patriarch* is not rightly understood. For he had a respect only to his wife, and not to himself, when he spake thus within him, *It ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women*, There was the wonder,

der, as for *Abraham*, he had sons by a young wife Thirty and Seven years afterward. Say they so? But how then will they answer *Paul*, *Rom. c. 4. v. 12.* 'Ου κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἥδη νεκρωμένον, *Non consideravit corpus suum jam emortuum, And he considered not his own body being dead, and Heb. c. 11. v. 12.* Διὸ καὶ ἀπ' ἐνὸς ἐξηγήθησαν καὶ ταῦτα νεκρωμένοι, &c. *Quocirca & ab uno orti sunt eoque emortuo, tanquam fidera coeli, Therefore sprang there even of one and him as good as dead, as the stars of the sky in multitude, Out of which places compared together Estius concludes, Satis ex his liquere scripturam non solum in Sara ponere miraculum sed etiam in Abraham. What to Musculus? Certe negari non potest ista verba Abrahami exprimere quandam senilis & emortui corporis considerationem tam in Abrahamo quam in Sara. What to Ambrose? Non dubito quod facias, ut & centum annorum seni dones filium, & Natura auctor Naturae metas relaxes. What to Chrysostom? Ὅτι περ φύσιν αἰθερώπινω ταῖς ἐπαγγελθένται καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἀρχῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γήινως λογικὴν ἀνενέργησεν, ὡς καὶ περὶ παροδοποιῶν ἀρχῆς, Supra humanam naturam promissaz erat enim Patriarcha praeseneſtute prope impotens & ad filiorum procreationem omnino inutilis. As to his having of sons by his young wife 37 years after, Why should not the Author of Nature enlarge the bounds of Nature? Why should not he by divine miracle*

racle repair and restore the strength of him that was almost dead, and make him to wax young again, whom he had foretold should be the Father of many Nations? Secondly, It doth not agree with reason, that *Moses* should leave the age of *Abraham*, on which depends the whole *Chronology* of the Church of God, in such uncertainty, that either we must fish it out or extort it by conjecture. They are the words of *Langius* upon another matter but of the same nature, *Quem quæso in finem hæc à Mose proscripta sunt, nisi ut temporum constaret ratio? Propter hoc ergo Moses tempora apposuit, ut veritas manifestior esset, To what end were these things written of Moses, but that there might appear a clear account of the times? For this reason therefore Moses set to the times, that the truth of them might be the more manifest.* But that the truth of them might be the more manifest as to the *Chronology* of the Church of God, whose age I beseech you ought to be more accurately certain, *Abrahams*, or *Terah's*? The knowledge truly of the time of the Birth of *Abraham* was absolutely necessary, but so was not the knowledge of the time of the death of *Terah*. How shall there appear a certain account of times, if it depend wholly upon conjecture, and that so improbable, most certainly disputable? But when you have the time of *Abrahams* Birth, and of his departure

F ture

ture out of *Charran*, you have a most sure account of the times, in which you may safely rest. Thirdly, That *Abraham* was not born in the Seventieth year of *Terah*, is against the most general opinion of the Ancients, to whom some reverence is due. Whereof I shall produce some Testimonies. The first shall be that I mentioned before out of *Josephus*, Θάρρα μὲν ἐβδμήντης ᾧ ποιῆται τὸ Ἀβραμῶν, *Thara 70 genuit Abrahamum*, and a little after Ἀβραμῶν δ' ἔχεν ἀδελφὸν Ναχὼρ καὶ Ἀεὺλιν, *Abrahamus vero habuit fratres Nachorem & Haranem*. From whence it manifestly appears what was the *Jews* opinion in *Josephus* his time, whatsoever they have written of that matter since, and that he thought it his business to determine the age of *Abraham* certain separately by it self, being not at all solicitous for the age of *Nahor* or *Haran*. There is another Testimony of the Patriarch *Nicephorus* before *Eusebius* his time, Θάρρα ἑπτηνῆντης ᾧ γεννᾷ τὸ Ἀβραμῶν, *Thara septuagenarius genuit Abrahamum*. Besides the judgment of *Eusebius* himself frequent in his *Chronicles*, as also of the *Latins*, as is to be collected out of *August. de Civit. Dei lib. 16. c. 10, and 15. and in Quest. super Genesim*. Neither is the Testimony and judgment of that learned *Arab. Gregorius Abul Pharaius* in his *Hist. dinast.* to be despised. Tareh filius Nahor. Natus est

illi Abraham cum esset secundum utramque simul sententiam 70 annorum, & ab hoc tempore convenit inter duos computos LXX & Hebræorum, *Terah was the son of Nahor. To him was Abraham born when he was according to both opinions joyntly of the age of 70 years, and from this time there is an agreement between the two accounts of the LXX and the Hebrews.* And this Testimony serves to shew the general opinion of the world. But how can there be said to be an agreement, if still they differ 60 years concerning the time of the Birth of *Abraham*? For these reasons therefore and Testimonies I cannot consent to the judgment of those that would have *Abraham* to be born in the 130 year of *Terah*. What then remains? If *Abraham* were born to *Terah* according to the letter of the Scripture in the 70 year of his age, and went out of *Charran* after the death of his Father in the 75 year of his own age, then must *Terah* die but 145 years old, for 70 and 75 make 145. And this is much more agreeable to reason, then the *Hebrew* reading. For it can scarcely be believed, that *Terah* should live 57 years longer then his Father *Nahor*, who lived but 148, when now the age of man began to decrease, neither did any of the succeeding *Patriarchs* ever attain that age, to wit, of 205 years, although they all received the blessing and the

Promises, whereas *Terah* is said to have served other Gods, *Jos. c. 24. v. 2.* And if you will believe *Suidas* he was himself ἀγαλματιστής, *Amaker of Images*; neither doth the *Scripture* say any thing explicitly of his conversion. Though notwithstanding Charity and even reason it self perswade us to believe that he did not persist in his *Idolatry* unto the time of his death, because he went out of *Ur* of the *Chaldees* with *Abraham* to go into the land of *Chanaan*, and abode together with him in *Charran* until the day of his death. Yet notwithstanding I cannot think he deserved from God the favour of an age so much longer then that of his *Fathers*, or of any of his *successors*. And why may it not be lawful by the same licence, whereby they deny that *Abraham* was born in the 70 year of *Terah* according to the letter of the *Scripture* and the opinion of the Ancients, for us to collect, and as confidently to affirm, that *Terah* was but 145 years old when he died, especially having for our more abundant credit a witness in *Eusebius* of more then 1300 years Antiquity, the *Samaritan Chronology*. *Θαρά γενέσθης ἐτῶν ὅ ἦν αἱ τ' Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ ἐπέζησεν ἐτι 75 ἐτῶν μετὰ τὴν αἰῶνα Ἀβραὰμ, Thara cum esset 70 annorum genuit Abrahamum & supervixit 75 usque ad 75 annum Abrahami, Terah being 70 years of age begat Abraham and lived after 75 years until the 75 of Abraham.* And with

with this doth the *Samaritan Pentateuch* perfectly agree, *Gen. c. 11. v. 32.* And the days of Terah were 145 years, and Terah died in Haran, Et fuerunt dies Tharæ Centum & quadraginta quinque anni, postea mortuus est Thara in Haran. And why should not this *Samaritical* witness be a witness of good credit, especially in a matter that is of it self so probable? What danger is there if we admit a fault or lapse in the *Hebrew* copy? We admit various readings in it, and why should not this difference between the *Samaritan* and the *Hebrew* be reputed a various or divers reading? It was the opinion of incomparable *Capellus* in his *Sacred Criticks*, Diversitatem inter Cod. Heb. & Samar. non alio referri videri quam ad variam quæ inter describendum solet accidere lectionem, That the diversity which is between the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* books, seem's not to be referred to any other cause, then to the various reading which doth often happen in the copying of them. Nay, if I mistake not, we meet with as gross a fault (if it be lawful to say so) and not less to be observed, and that likewise in point of number, *Gen. c. 2. v. 2.* Complevitque deus כִּי־בִיַּעַ הִשְׁבִּיעַ in die septimo opus suum quod fecerat, And on the seventh day God finished the work which he had made. And who is so tenacious of the *Jewish Masora* who will not acknowledge an er-

rour or mistake in this place, and confess it
 ought to be read, Et perfecit Deus ביום הששי
 in die Sexto opus suum quod fecerat, & re-
 quievit in die Septimo ab omni opere suo quod
 fecerat, *And in the Sixth day God finished the
 work which he had made, and he rested (as it fol-
 loweth) on the Seventh day from all his work
 which he had made. As the Samaritan, the
 Syriack and all the Greek Interpreters do read?*
 If then it be equal to mend the reading in
 this place, why should it not be lawful to
 mend it in the age of Terah, the sense requiring
 an emendation in both places? They are the
 words of the same Capellus, Non pauca esse
 ἀναιμακτα ἄπορα quæ vix alia ratione solvi
 aut conciliari possunt quam admittendo le-
 vem in sacro codice lapsum emendandum, *That
 there are not a few irreconcilable doubts in the
 Scripture, which are scarce by any other means
 to be solved or reconciled, then by admitting
 some light fault to be amended in the holy
 Bible.* Which why it should not be done
 here in this very place of the age of Terah,
 when as the Samaritan reading doth so han-
 somly reconcile Stephen with Moses, and Mo-
 ses with himself, I see one only obstacle, which
 also that incomparable man observed, Reli-
 gio est vel latum pilum à codicibus Hebræis
 ut Rabbiorum curâ nobis transmittuntur re-
 cedere vel ipsorum lectionem vitii arguere,
We count it a scruple of conscience to depart
 but

but a hairs breadth from the Hebrew Copies as they are transmitted to us by the care of the Rabbins [our professed enemies] or to find the least fault with their reading. And if we be so resolved, the best way is, with Scaliger, to leave this knot to be untied till Elias comes.

V. 15, 16. Κατίβη ὁ Ἰακώβ εἰς Ἀίγυπτον, καὶ ἐπελόησεν αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμεῖς. Καὶ μετέβησαν εἰς Συχέμ, καὶ ἐτέθησαν ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃ αἰνήσατο Ἀβραάμ πρὸς ἀργυρίῳ ὡς τὸ ὑῶν Ἐμμόρ τῷ Συχέμ, Et descendit Jacob in Ægyptum & defunctus est ipse & patres nostri, & translati sunt in Sichem, & positi sunt in sepulchro quod emit Abraham pretio argenti à filiis Emmor Patris Sichem, So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died he and our Fathers, and were carried over into Sichem, and laid in the sepulchre which Abraham had bought for a summ of mony of the sons of Emmor the Father of Sichem. This Translation makes this place subject to many mistakes and difficulties out of which we are not yet fairly delivered. For first it implies by the connexion of the conjunction *copulative*, that Jacob as well as the Fathers were carried over into Sichem, &c. Whereas Jacob was buried long before the coming up out of Egypt by Joseph and the Elders of Israel, in the cave of the field of Macpelah which Abraham bought of Ephron the Hittite, Gen. c. 50. v. 13.

Next it avoweth a positive contradiction to the letter of the *Old Testament*, in saying that *Abraham* bought a burying place of the Sons of *Emmor* the Father of *Sichem*, when as that which he bought was of *Ephron* the *Hittite*, and *Jacob* the purchaser of the Sons of *Emmor*. Lastly it necessarily implies that the *Fathers* were buried in *Sichem*, whereas in all reason and probability they were buried in the same place where their *Fathers* were, to wit, in *Hebron*. For as I said before *Jacob* was surely buried in the cave of the field of *Macpelah* which *Abraham* bought with the field for a possession for a burying place (questionless for his Family) of *Ephron* the *Hittite*, Gen. c. 49. v. 30. As he sware his son *Joseph* to bury him in the burying place of his *Fathers*, Gen. c. 47. v. 30. Where they buried *Abraham* and *Sarah* his wife, where they buried *Isaac* and *Rebecca* his wife, and where he buried *Leah*, Gen. c. 49. v. 31. And where *Jacob* and *Leah* were both buried, (and their *Fathers* and *Mothers* also) its more then probable, that all their Family was also buried, *Joseph* being only buried in *Sichem* (and probably his Family,) according to the oath which he took of the Children of *Israel*, Gen. c. 50. v. 25. In a parcel of ground which *Jacob* bought of *Emmor* and gave his son *Joseph* for a portion above his Brethren, and which afterwards became the inheritance of his Children,

dren, Jos. c. 24. v. 32. And to this conjecture, if it be not more, there is nothing to object (besides this place which I shall endeavour to reconcile) but the testimony of *S^t Hierome* who in his *Epitaph* upon *Paula* saith, *that the brothers of Joseph were buried in Sichem*. But with reverence to so great a Father, I suppose I may without offence oppose to his the Testimony of *Josephus*, who in his second book of *Jewish Antiquities* expressly saith, *Καὶ τὰ τῶν μὲν τοῦ ὁσέως &c.* And the bodies of these, that is, of the brethren of *Joseph*, were carried back by their Children and Grandchildren and buried in *Hebron*. But *Josephs* bones were carried by the Hebrews into *Chanaan* when they departed out of *Aegypt*, as he had bound them by an oath, Gen. c. 50. v. 25. Exod. c. 13. v. 19. According to which they were buried in *Sichem*, Jos. c. 24. v. 32. Neither was this at all abhorring from reason or duty, that they should first bury the bones of *Joseph* in *Sichem*, for honours sake, he having been the *President* of *Aegypt*, and from thence carry over the bones of the rest of the Fathers to be buried in *Hebron*. And truly if we weigh the Testimonies, I know not why *Josephus* may not be credited in a matter of Story which concerns his own Nation, also of whom he writ of purpose, especially coming nearest to reason and the sense of Scripture. To rectifie theretore the first possi-

possible mistake, I would have it rendred thus, Et descendit Jacob in *Aegyptum*, & defunctus est ipse, & Patres nostri, & μετέθνουν, & ipsi translati sunt in Sichem, understanding αὐτοὶ, or qui translati sunt, as Beza interprets &, *Act. c. 6. v. 6.* and elsewhere. Whereof you may see examples in note on *Matth. c. 27. v. 9, 10.* and on *Joh. c. 15. v. 6.* So Jacob went down into *Aegypt*, and he died, and our Fathers, and they were carried, or who were carried over into Sichem. That is, our Fathers and not Jacob. And to reconcile the two latter difficulties, I would have it Translated and pointed thus, Καὶ μετέθνουν εἰς Συχέμ, & ἐτέθνουν ἐν τῷ μνήματι (ὃ ὠνήσαστο Ἀβραάμ πρὸς υἱοὺς ἀργυρίῳ) ὧν τῶ υἱῶν Ἐμμόρ τῆ Συχέμ, Et ipsi, or Qui translati sunt in Sichem, & positi in sepulchro (quod emerat Abraham pretio argenti) à filiis Emmor Patris Sichem, And they, or Who were carried over into Sichem, and laid in the sepulchre (which Abraham had bought with a price of money) from the sons of Emmor the Father of Sichem. That is by a frequent metathesis, And they were carried over into Sichem, and from the sons of Emmor the Father of Sichem, or from Sichem, which in effect is all one, they were laid in the Sepulchre which Abraham had bought with a price of money. And by this Translation, which in its self is lawful, as to the Grammar or use of speech, there

there is no violence at all to the truth of the History, for hereby it is not affirmed that they were laid in the sepulchre, which *Abraham had bought of the sons of Emmor*, which doth so grossly contradict the letter of the *Old Testament*, or that they were buried all in *Sichem*, it implying quite otherwise that from *Sichem* they were laid in the sepulchre which *Abraham had bought with a price of money*, to wit in *Hebron* according to the saying of *Josephus*, probability of reason and sense of Scripture. Neither is this Translation forc't at all. For *παρὰ* doth as well nay more properly signifie, *From*, then, *Of*, for it properly signifies motum à persona, the motion from a person, nay sometimes from things inanimate, as *παρὰ νεῶν*, from the ships, in *Homer*; so as I know not why it need were it might not by a familiar transposition be rendred thus, *παρὰ τῷ Συχεμ τῷ υἱῷ Ἐμμορ*, From *Sichem* that is *παρὰ τῷ ἀγρῷ Συχεμ*, from the field of *Sichem*, as it is called in the *Old Testament*, which was the sons of *Emmor*. Neither am I altogether without a witness, Learned *De Dieu* agreeth with us, when he saith *παρὰ τῷ υἱῷ Ἐμμορ* non esse construendum cum ὠνόματο sed cum ἐπίθετον, which opinion he thought was the best because of the Authority of *Josephus*.

V. 19. Οὐτὸς κατασφραγίσμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἐκείνου τῆς πατέρας ἡμῶν τὸ ποιῆν ἐκθε-
τα

ταυτὰ βρέθη αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ μὴ ζῶον ἐᾶσαι. These words under favour are not aptly Translated by any Interpreter that I ever yet read. For I cannot be perswaded that the *Hebrews* could possibly be so barbarous and inhumane, though forc't with never so much cruelty, as to cast forth their own Infants to the end they might not live, as the Translations do generally imply. Neither doth *Moses* tell us of any such thing in *Exodus*, but that *Pharaoh* commanded his own people (*the Hebrew Midwives refusing to execute his commands because they feared God*) expressly in these words, Every Son that is born to the Hebrews ye shall cast into the river, *Exod. c. 1 v. 22*. So that to bring these words to a more proper and truer sense, I conceive they may be more rightly Translated, and that without force in this manner, *Hic circumveniens genus nostrum, afflixit Patres nostros faciendo projici infantes eorum, ne servarentur vivi, The same dealing subtilly with our kindred, evilly intreated our Fathers by causing their children to be cast forth, to the end that they might not live.* Εἰθετα with *Suidas*, ἐκπατῖσθαι, projected, exposed or cast forth, τὸ παῖν εἰθετα, is all one with ἐκπύδναι and may by good Authority be Translated, faciendo projici, by causing to be cast forth. You may read the same phrase purely in the same sense, *1 King. c. 17 v. 20*. Σὺ κενγκῶνς τὸ θανάτωσαι τὸ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τῆς,

τῆς, Tu afflixisti *viduam* faciendo mori filium ejus, or as the *Latin Interpreter* of the LXX, interficiendo filium ejus, or as our late *Interpreter*, mortem afferendo filio ejus, Thou hast also brought evil upon the widow with whom I sojourn by slaying of her son. The like you have in *Ruth* c. 1. v. 6.

Ὁπ ἐπίσκεπται κύριος τὸ ἔχον αὐτῶ τῷ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς ἄρτους, Quod visitaverat dominus populum ejus dando eis panem. As *Pagnin* rightly renders it. That the Lord had visited his people by giving them bread. And *Psal.* 78. v. 18. Καὶ ἐξεπείρασεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν τὸ αἰτῆσαι βρώματα ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν, Et tentarunt deum in corde suo petendo cibum, &c. And they tempted God in their hearts by asking meat for their lusts.

V. 30. Καὶ πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν πεντηκόντα. Et expletis annis quadraginta, And when Forty years were expired. That is, From the time that *Moses* was said to be full Forty years old, v. 23. for now he was Fourscore, when the *Angel of the Lord* appeared unto him in the bush. v. 35. Ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου, By the hand of the Angel which appeared unto him in the bush. But that Angel was God himself, *Exod.* c. 3. v. 6, and 13. and so beneath, v. 38. Μετὰ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ, Who was with the Angel who spake to him in mount Sina. But that Angel is several times called God, *Exod.* c. 19. and so again it follows, v. 53.

Ἔτις διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, *Who have received the law by the disposition of Angels, the same with that, Gal. c. 3. v. 19. Ὁ νόμος διαταγὰς δι' ἀγγέλων, The Law was ordained by Angels. When yet tis expressly said, Exod. c. 20. v. 1. Et locutus est Elohim, And God spake these words and said. So also it is said, Gen. c. 48. v. 15. Ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, ὁ θεὸς ὁ τρέφων μὲ, &c. Ὁ ἀγγελὸς ὁ ῥυομένης με, &c. The God of Abraham and Isaac, the God which did feed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel, which redeemed me from all evil bleſs the lads. And Judg. c. 13. v. 21, 22. Manoah calleth the Angel of God, God, for he knew that he was an Angel of God, and yet immediately ſaith, we ſhall ſurely die becauſe we have ſeen God. So Luk. c. 2. v. 9. The Angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord ſhone round about them, that is of the Angel of the Lord. From which examples it is manifeſt, That it is no ſtrange thing, to have that aſcribed unto Angels, which God doth by their miniſtry, and that ſometimes Angels are called by the name of God, and God, ſometime by the name of an Angel. The reaſon is becauſe all the outward works of God are done by the miniſtry of Angels. For God cannot properly be ſaid to have a mouth or hands or feet, to ſpeak or go before, or to appear. With or by his will he doth all things, putting it in*

execu-

execution by his ministring spirits, who are his intermediate Messengers and Actors. Which very order is observed also by earthly *Princes*, who for the most part execute all publick matters by their Ministers.

V. 45. Ἦν καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, Quod etiam introduxerunt Patres nostri accipientes successive alius ab alio cum Jesu in possessionem Gentium, *Which also our Fathers receiving successively one from another brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles.* Διαδέχμεναι, τὸ ἔχει πολλῶν ἐρχόμενον ἀφ' ἑτέρου εἰς ἕτερον ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἦκον δέχμεναι, *Phau.*

C. 10. v. 36, 37, 38. Τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενον, εἰρηνῶς ἔχει Ἰησοῦς χριστός (ἐστὶ ἐν παντὶ Κύριος) ὑμεῖς οἰδατε, τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρχαίμενον ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός, &c. Τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα is here to be taken *πεχνικῶς*, or *appositively*. Before Ἰησοῦ I conceive with the *Syriack Interpreter* you are to understand *κατὰ*, then which nothing is more frequent. Verbum quod misit filiis Israel annuncians pacem per Jesum Christum (hic est omnium dominus) vos noſtis, verbum scilicet quod fuit per totam Judæam, initium sumens à Galilæa post baptismum quod prædicavit Johannes de Jesu Nazareno, quomodo nuxerit eum Deus spiritu sancto,

sancto, &c. The word which he sent to the children of Israel preaching peace through Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all) ye know, to wit, the word which was through all Judea beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the holy Ghost, &c. Ye know, that is, ye have heard of, ye cannot be ignorant of a discourse or talk that hath been so common through all Judea, how the holy Ghost descended upon him when he was baptized of John in the River Jordan, and how afterward he went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil.

C. 13. v. 20. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἔπειτα πεντήκοντα ἔδωκε κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ, &c. And after that he gave them Judges the space of 450 years until Samuel the Prophet. This place, saith Scaliger, is crux Chronologorum. The truth is, Interpreters also have not been a little vexed with it. Among whom there are not few, who maintain this reading and interpretation, which our English here have used. And this is very plausibly made good by Beroaldus Chron. lib. 3. c. 4. by adding in his computation the years of the Oppressers to the number of those of the Judges, which beginning from the time that Cusshanrishathaim began to oppress Israel, Judg. c. 3. v. 8. do make up the just number of 450 years until Samuel.

But

But besides the just exceptions which may be taken to this account, as that the time of the *Elders* who judged *Israel* immediately after *Joshua* is not mentioned nor comprized in it, who cannot be denied to have been *Judges*, though how long, it is not evident in *Scripture*. *Eusebius* saith, *Tradition* gave them 18 years, *Africanus* allowed them 30, but how long or short so ever, it adds to the account of 450 years, so that the number cannot be so precise as he would have it: And besides that the 20 years of *Sampson*, in which he Judged *Israel* in the days of the *Philistines*, into whose hands *God* gave the *Israelites* the space of 40 years, are to be deducted out of those days, which must necessarily make the account not to be so exact. *Beroaldus* hath made himself an unanswerable objection. And that is this. Putting or supposing that the time from the coming out of *Agypt* to the building of the Temple may not be questioned to be other then 480 years, as it is punctually set down, 1 *King*. c. 6. v. 1. which account himself and *Beza* do both maintain is precisely to be observed, if we allow 450 years to the Judges, adding 40 to *Moses* in the wilderness, 18 to *Joshua*, (and none allow him fewer) 40 to *Samuel* and *Saul*, 30 to *David*, and 4 to *Solomon* before the beginning of the building of the Temple, the whole will be (not reckoning the *Elders*) 582 years,

K

so

so as observing his own rule, it is impossible that 450 years can be allowed to the times of the *Judges*. Tis true he tells you, *That it is to be noted for the better understanding of the Apostle, That some years are repeated twice, as the years of the Israelites oppression are said to be comprehended in and referred to that summ of years, in which its said there was peace, and that the land had rest from war. Whereof the Apostle being not at all solicitous, did nominate that summ, which all the several summs [of Judges and Oppressors] made up together.* But that the *Apostle* had these considerations, the times of the *Elders* and the 20 years of *Sampson* making also the account so imperfect and uncertain, or that he had none at all, is not probable. Neither is it credible, that against the light of his own and common knowledge he would have mentioned a summ of years which was not reconcileable with the letter of holy *Scripture*. For that had been an egregious scandal to the *Jews*, who were neither ignorant, nor inobservant of the computation of the Times. This reading and interpretation therefore being subject to so just exceptions, I suppose we may without injury inquire into some other, and truly I meet with none less liable to exception than that of those, who would not have it here meant, how long *God* gave them *Judges*, but when he gave them, and for that cause distinguishing

guish and refer those words, Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα
 ὡς ἔπειτα περὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ πάντων αὐτῶν, to the words
 going before, v. 17. that is to the time when
the God of the children of Israel chose their
Fathers, so as the words ought to be pointed,
 and rendred otherwise then commonly they
 are in most Translations, in *English* thus, *And*
afterwards about 450 years, that is by a fami-
 liar *Metathesis*, Καὶ ὡς ἔπειτα περὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ πε-
 ρὶ πάντων αὐτῶν ἔδωκε κριτὰς, &c. *And a-*
bout 450 years afterwards he gave them Jud-
ges, &c. according to which sense read the
Old Latin and the *Æthiopick Interpreters*.
 Now this time wherein *God* may properly be
 said to have chosen their Fathers, about 450
 years before he gave them Judges, is by them
 computed from the Birth of *Isaac*, in whom
God may properly be said to have chosen
 their Fathers. For *God* who had chosen *Abra-*
ham out of all the people of the earth, out of the
 children of *Abraham* at this time chose *Isaac*,
 in whose Family the Covenant was to rest.
 And to make this computation evident ; From
 the Birth of *Isaac* they say, to the Birth of *Jacob*
 are 60 years, from thence to their going into
Egypt 130, from thence to their coming out
 210, from thence to their entrance into the
 land of *Canaan* 40, and from thence to the
 division of the Land, the time wherein it had
 rest, about which time its probable they be-
 gan to settle their Government by Judges, 7
 years,

years, which altogether make up 447. And if it should be reckoned from the year before when *God* established his Covenant between himself and *Abraham* and *Isaac*, even before he was born, and all his seed after him, Gen. c. 17. v. 19. at which time *God* may be said as properly to have chosen their Fathers if not more, then it will be 448 years, which comes one year nearer to our number of 450. But our Learned and Judicious *Usher* makes it from the Birth of *Isaac* to the division of the Land (which he saith was about 450 years after the election of the Fathers) 452 years. And others almost if not just 450. From whence we may conjecture that by reason of this uncertainty of computation, *The Apostle* did express the circumstance of the time with an *ὥς*, a circiter, an about 450 years. So as *Scaliger* saith, it was very wisely said of *Eusebius*, Τὸν Ἀπόστολον οὐκ ἀκριβοῦς λόγον εἰπεῖν ἀλλὰ ἐκδοχῇ γινώσκειν, &c. That the *Apostle* spake not according to exact account, but with a common exception, that is, so as it be a number according to ordinary speaking, whereby we pronounce any sum totally, but not exactly. So with *Demosthenes* and *Plautus* we see that called a Talent, where notwithstanding some drams are wanting or abounding. And this, saith he, is vulgatissima numerandi ratio, as was mentioned before.

V. 27. Οἱ γὰρ καὶ τοιοῦτοι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἦν
οἱ

οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν τῶτον, ἀγνοοῦντες ἢ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας, κρίναντες, ἐπέησαν. *The English Translator hath exprest the sence, but not Translated strictly to the words, which by reason of the Synchysis, and involved and perplexed trajection being not well distinguished, are not for the most part so rightly rendred as they ought. And from hence it is, as Heinsius hath observed, that the force and emphasis of the reprehension is quite lost, by which the Apostle most elegantly seems to reprove the blind ignorance and stupidity of the Jews, who when they pored altogether on the Scriptures, did yet do the very same thing of which they were in them forewarn'd, that is, they went about to take him away who in them was to the Eye pointed out their Messias, the very Person whom they expected. The words therefore may in my opinion be more lively rendred, as they are before distinguished, Thus, Qui enim habitabant in Jerusalem, & principes eorum, hunc condemnantes, ignorantes etiam voces Prophetarum quæ unoquoque legebantur Sabbato impleverunt, For they which dwelt in Jerusalem, and their Rulers, condemning him, not understanding even the voices of the Prophets which were read every Sabbath, fulfilled them. That is, by condemning of Jesus, they fulfilled the Scriptures although they were duly read unto them every Sabbath,*

bath. The like implicate and perplex tra-
 jections you may find in *Demosthenes*, whom
Stephanus affirms to have used them. Ad ve-
 nustutem sermoni conciliandam, To gain a
 grace unto his speech. And in *Plato*, such as
 is that in his *Phadras*, Ἀληθῆ, ἔφη, λέγεις, ὁ
 Σωκράτης, ὦ Κέβης, Vera, inquit, dicis, *Socra-*
tes, O *Cebes*. For, Ἀληθῆ λέγεις ὦ Κέβης, ἔφη
 ὁ Σωκράτης, Vera dicis O *Cebes*, inquit *Socrates*.
 Which kind of speech *Cicero* seems to have
 imitated and affected. As, *Noli*, inquit, *mi-*
rari, *Africanus*. And O magnam, inquit, *ar-*
tem, *Brutus*. See *Beza* his Exposition upon
Act. c. 24. v. 22. and *Joh. c. 13. v. 8.* Οὐ
 μὴ νίψῃς τὰς πόδας μου εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα, *Nunquam*
lavabis pedes meos. See also *Luk. c. 8. v. 14.*
1 Cor. c. 10. v. 27. *Philp. c. 1. v. 21.* Ἐμὴ
 ἦν τὸ ζῆν, Χεῖρο, καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, κέρδιον,
Mihi enim Christus est in vita, & in morte
lucrum, understanding κατὰ before τὸ ζῆν, and
 τὸ ἀποθανεῖν. See *James* also, *c. 2. v. 1. c. 3.*
v. 3. and *Pet. 1 Ep. c. 3. v. 21.* and *2 Ep.*
c. 1. v. 19.

V. 41. Ἰδετε οἱ καταφρονεῖται καὶ θαυμάσιον,
 καὶ ἀφανεῖσθε, &c. The *Apostle* cites neither
Greek nor *Hebrew* strictly, but comes nearest
 to the *Greek*, whom saving the sense he hath
 contracted, For with them *Habak. c. 1. v. 5.*
 tis read, Ἰδετε οἱ καταφρονεῖται, καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε,
 καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια, καὶ ἀφανιεῖσθε, but in
 the *Hebrew*, ראו כגוים והבישו והתמיהו תמיהו

Videte

Videte intergentes & aspicite, & obstupefcite, obstupefcite, as some Translate it, one and the same word being twice repeated. But the LXX whose custom it is to render one and the same word diversly according to the possible diversity of the points or letters, after they had according to the common reading rendred the words suitably, θαυμάσιτε θαυμάσια, supposing the ingemination of the Hebrew meant some intenceness in the act, as if you should say, mire miremini, *be ye wonderfully astonisht,* suspecting still the word תמה, might possibly and ought to be read תמה rather then the other word twice, the mistake also being so easie by reason of the likeness of the letters, especially if blurred or blotted, or any corner of a letter at all omitted in the copy, added likewise ἀφανισθητε, which aptly suites with תהם, that signifies, σκεπάσθητε, latibulum quærite, or tegimini, *seek ye a hiding place, or hide your selves.* In which sense you may see it Translated, Psal. 60. v. 4. and Isai. c 30. v. 2. And so ἀφανίζειν with Hesychius is σκεπάσαι, tegere or abscondere, *to hide or cover.* So Plut. de Pyth. Orac. Ἀφανίζειν εἰς θελει το αληθεῖς, Non vult abscondere veritatem, *He will not conceal or hide the truth.* And elsewhere, Οἱ γὰρ ἑλαφοὶ κατὰ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀφανίζουσι κατὰ τὴν γῆν ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ κέρα, Cervi quando decidit cornu defodiunt & abscondunt in terrâ, *Stags when their Horns fall off*

dig and hide them in the earth. So Job c. 22. v. 20. the word כָּחַר which signifies to hide, the LXX render ἀφανίζαν. And in this sense this word may possibly be more aptly and more significantly rendred here, Videte Contemptores, & obstupefcite & adscindimini, Behold ye Despisers, and be amazed, and hide your selves, or seek ye hiding places. And that this may be so, I believe the rather because of the similitude of the Hebrew Characters, which makes them so prone to be mistaken, and that we may almost infallibly conclude the same hath happened in another word in this very place of Habak. where instead of בְּנִיִּים, as it is now read in the Hebrew, and accordingly Translated, inter gentes, among the nations, the Greek Interpreters did surely read בְּנִיִּים and accordingly Translated, καταφρονῶνται, Contemptores, Despisers. And so they frequently Translate the same word, as Prov. c. 13. v. 16. וַיִּרְךְ בְּנִיִּים אִתְּהֶן, Ὅδοις καταφρονουῶτων ἐν ἀπολείᾳ, Viæ contemnentium in perditione, The way of Despisers is in destruction. Zeph. c. 3. v. 4. Περσῆται ἄνθρωποι, ἀνδρες καταφρονῶνται, Prophetæ ejus portantes spiritum, viri contemptores, Her Prophets carry the spirit, men that are despisers. You shall find the same word in this very chapter of Habak. v. 13. And in truth these words seem not to be spoken to the Gentiles, but to the Jews, whom alone the

Pro-

Prophets immediate discourse did totally concern, upon whom even in their days was to come that great devastation of the *Babylonish* Captivity, of which he here surely Prophecied (and not against *Nebuchadrezzar* and the *Chaldeans*, as Expositors do generally conclude, led thereunto by the misreading of these very words כְּנִי *inter Gentes.*) For it is the common opinion *Habakkuk* prophecied in the days of *Manasseh*, and it suits well with the matter of his Prophecy and the circumstance of time, For in *Manasseh* his days for the abominable wickedness which was committed in the same did the Lord speak by his Prophet saying, Behold I am bringing such evil upon *Jerusalem* and *Judah* that whosoever heareth of it both his ears shall tingle, and I will forsake the remnant of mine inheritance, and deliver them into the hands of their enemies; and they shall become a prey and a spoil to all their enemies, 2 King. c. 21. v. 12, 14. The very subject matter of our Prophets prophecy, so that *Habakkuk* might probably enough be that very Prophet, who here comes with an *Ecce* to them, because they perverted judgment, despised the Law of God and were full of violence, Ἰδοὺ καὶ παραφροσύνη, &c. Behold ye despisers and be amazed, and hide your selves, for I will work a work in your days which ye will not believe, though it be told you, For Lo, I will raise up the *Chaldeans*, &c. and they shall gather

gather the captivity as the sand, v. 9. So as without question this denuntiation of the Prophet was here directed to the *Jews*, whom he here calls כְּנָגֵר, *despisers*, that they should behold and with astonishment admire the work of the *Lord* which he was to do in their days, so as for very amazement and consternation they should seek to hide themselves, and with the very hills would come down and cover them from the dreadful wrath which was to come. And least this fate should now come again upon the *Jews*, the *Apostle* bids them in this place beware, in the foregoing verse, foresignifying the fearful Destruction of *Jerusalem*, then near at hand.

V. 48. Καὶ ἐπίστανται ὅσοι ἦσαν πεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, Et crediderunt quotquot erant præordinati ad vitam æternam, as the *Old Latin*: Ordinati, as *Beza*, but in the same sense as we Translate it also. *And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.* But this is but a harsh and unusual version of πεταγμένοι, the word πάντες or πάντεςδε, being no where to be found in that sense, neither doth it agree with the sense of *Scripture*, as many are of opinion. And truly I for my part doubt whether all that then believed were præordained to eternal life [might there not be some Apostates?] I am sure there is nothing to oblige my faith thereto, I conceive no more then those which in *Corinth* are called *Saints*,
who

who surely believed also, otherwise the *Apostle* would never have called them *Saints*, neither had they been reputed part of the *Church* which was in *Corinth*, who I suppose there is no man will affirm, were all saved, as are in their sense, those who were preordained to eternal life. That therefore this place may bring no weight to the establishing of so controverted a sense, of which there will never be an end of disputing till *Elias* comes, why may not these words be better distinguished and Translated, thus: Καὶ ἐπί-
 ςθεν, ὅσοι ᾔκουσαν πεταγμένοι, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον,
 Et crediderunt, quotquot convenerunt, in vi-
 tam æternam, And as many as were met to-
 gether, believed in eternal life. The *Jews* held themselves unworthy of eternal life, by putting the word of God from them, v. 46. But the *Gentiles* when they heard it, they were glad and glorified the word of the Lord, and as many as were met together believed in eternal life. Πεταγμένοι being taken in the same sense with συναγμένοι, which word was used, v. 44. Πιστεύω εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, is one of the articles of our Creed, the very subject of the *Apostles* preaching, *Joh. c. 17. v. 3.* And as for the interpretation of πεταγμένοι, as it is not unsuitable to the place, no more is it new without Authority. For the *Hebrew* *ו'*, which is frequently by the *LXX* Translated, συναγω, and συναθροίζω, convenio, and
 con-

congrego, is also by them Translated, *τάττω*,
Exod. c. 29. v. 43. וְנִעְרַתִּי שָׁמָּה רֶבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
Kai táttōm exē tois hōis 'Israhēl, Et conve-
niam ibi filiis Israel, Pagnin. And there I will
meet with the children of Israel, as in our own
Translation. And though some perhaps may
say that this was a mistake in the Seventy
Interpreters, which yet is but spoken of free
cost, for Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotio
Translated so likewise, or that they meant
[precipiam] as their Latin Interpreter would
have it, certainly the genuine sence of τάττω
hath in it something near of kin to our In-
terpretation. For τάττω is properly εἰς τάξιν
αἰθισῶ, in ordine colloco, to place in order,
so as it aborreth not from our sence to say,
And as many as were placed in order, [to
hear the word of God] believed in eternal
life, or as many as were instructed, according
to the force of the word, precipiam, that is,
as many as were instructed in what the A-
postle taught them. Nor can I be otherwise
perswaded, but that εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, must
necessarily be construed with ἐπίτρεψαν, what
sense soever is put upon παραγγέλαι.

C. 14. v. 23. Χειροτονήσαντες δ' αὐτοῖς, &c.
That is, as some, χειροτόνησαντες, And when
they had appointed them Elders, or as others,
When they had ordained them Elders, in the
Ecclesiastical sence as it is at this day used.
But which of these two is the truer or more
pro-

proper in this place, is no small question. If I may speak with liberty, after a serious disquisition, I cannot but profess, I totally assent to them who would have *Luke* here mean *καταστήσαντες*, *having appointed*, and not *Ordained*, in the other sense. For I am not convinced with Argument or Testimony, so as to believe, that *Χειροτονία* did by it self alone at that time, or many years after signify either *Χειροθεσίαν*, *Imposition of hands*, or *Καθιέρωσιν*, *Consecration*. So that all which *Zonaras* affirms concerning the true acception of this word in the beginning of his *Scholia* upon the first *Canon* of the *Apostles*, (to what end or by what impulse soever) I think is very really right and true. Whose words, because they fully express my meaning, and that they may be better understood by other Authorities, which I shall alledge, I have thought fit here to set down. *Νῦν μὲν χειροτονία καλεῖται*, &c. *Now adays a course of prayers, and invocation on the holy Spirit, when one is initiated into the Priesthood, and receiveth consecration, is called Cheirotomia, from thence so termed, because the Bishop extends his hand over him whom he bleisseth; when he is chosen into holy orders, But Anciently the choice or suffrage was called Cheirotomia, For when it was lawful for the multitude in their Cities to choose their Priests or Bishops, the multitude met together, and*
some

some chose one man, some another, but that it might appear, whose suffrage won, they say the Electors did use *εκτείνειν τὰς χεῖρας*, to stretch forth their hands, and by their hands so stretched forth or up, they were numbred who chose the one and who the other. And him who was Elected by the most suffrages or voices, they placed in the high Priesthood, that is, made him Bishop. And from hence was the name of Chierotonia taken, which also the Fathers of the Councils are found so to have used, calling their suffrage, *Cheirotonia*. An example whereof he bringeth out of the fifth Canon of the Council of Laodicea. And thus far *Zonaras*. From whom it manifestly appears, that the word *Cheirotonia* in the Ecclesiastical sense, as it is now used of Ordination, was then new and borrowed long after the *Apostles* times. And to prove this yet more fully, laying aside and barring all suspected and questionable Authorities, let us do it with such Testimonies of Primitive writers, whose Authority is found and received of all. Beginning first with *Paul* himself, 2 Cor. c. 8. v. 19. Where the brother whose praise is in the Gospel, and that was questionless *S^t Luke*, is said to be *χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαίου*, appointed by the Churches, a companion to travel with *S^t Paul*. And I cannot think that any man will soberly and seriously affirm, that he was ordained by the Churches in the sense of

Ordin-

Ordination as it is now understood, by *Invocation, Imposition of hands, and Consecration*. And from him let us descend to the next Writers who are universally counted genuine. In which rank in the first place is *Ignatius* in his *Epistle* to the *Philadelphians*, where you have these words, Πρέπον ἐστὶν ὑμῖν ὡς ἐκκλησία θεῷ χειροτονῆσαι ἐπίσκοπον, *Ye ought as a Church of God to choose or appoint a Bishop*, to wit, for or to the Church of *Antioch* in *Syria*. Where I suppose likewise no body can soberly say that the *Bishops* are there understood, as if he had written to the *Church Representative*, when he writes indefinitely to all the *Philadelphians*, whom he calls collectively the Church, and to whom he gives particular instructions, not proper to the *Bishops* if alone. And from him let us come to the *Ecclesiastical Historians*, Among whom for the most part, if not altogether the words χειροτονία, and χειροτονεῖν do signifie or import *election* or *constitution*, to choose or to appoint. Nay in some places it must be necessarily Translated, and I believe it may be lawfully so in all. So we read, *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib 6. c. 29.* Τῶν γὰρ ἀδελφῶν ἀπάντων χειροτονίας ἕνεκα ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ συγκεροτημένων, *All the brethren being gathered together in the Church for the election of a Bishop*. So *Socrat. lib. 2. c. 6.* *Alexander the Bishop of Constantinople* is said to have died,

ἔδδεν

ὅθεν αἰς τὸ αὐτὸ τόπον χειροτονήσαι, *not having appointed any body in his place.* And c. 26. Ἐγένετο πολλὴ φιλονεικία περὶ χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπων, &c. *There was a great contention about the election of a Bishop, some desiring one and some another.* So Theodoret. lib. 4. c. 6. Ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπηροῦ τὴν χειροτονίαν παρόντων, *I gave a voice with others to thy election.* There are many more examples in the same Authors to the same purpose, as in Zozomen, also, lib. 3. c. 7. and elsewhere, and in Evagr. lib. 3. c. 13. Pergamius is said to be Ὑπαρχὸς τῆς Αἰγύπτου χειροτονηθεὶς, *Appointed President of Ægypt.* And so we have in Philo. in leg. ad Caium. Χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπαρχοῖς, *To those who were appointed Governours of Provinces.* Not to speak of *Prophane Authors*, among whom *Maximus Tyrius* hath a notable example of *Darius* his wanton Horse, who ἐχειροτόνησεν αὐτὸν εἰς ἀρχὴν, *chose his Master to be King.* So that as far as I can collect from the Testimonies of the *Antient*, χειροτονεῖν with them did signifie to *elect* or to *appoint*. Tis true, we find the word in the other sense of *Ordination*, in several Books which pretend to great *Antiquity*, as in the *Canons of the Apostles*, the *Constitutions of Clemens*, and *Respons. ad Orthodoxos*, which passeth under the name of *Justin Martyr*, but there being just cause of suspicion among the Learned of the Authors and Antiquities of every one of them,

them, it is not reasonable that their suspected Authority should impose a law for the use of a word, on the Testimony of others whose truth or credit was never yet call'd in question. I shall only add an argument or two. It is not likely that *Luke* whom all acknowledge skilful in the language of the *Greeks*, would use a word in a sense not known unto them, nor possible to be known. Neither is it probable that none of the Ancient *Lexicographers* should make any mention at all of any such sense as is that of *Zonaras* his Ordination; with *Invocation of the spirit* and *Imposition of hands*, who generally say *Χειροτονήσαντες, χειροτόνησαντες, ἐκλεξαμένοι. Χειροτονία, ἐκλογή· χειροτονεῖν, ὑψιζεῖν, καθιζεῖν*. Being therefore convinced with these Testimonies and arguments I cannot but believe, that in Antient times *χειροτονεῖν* did signifie no more then *to elect* or *appoint*, and consequently that *χειροτονήσαντες* in this place denotes no more then the bare *appointing of Elders by Paul and Barnabas*, and not *Imposition of hands* or *Consecration*, or, which we call now a days, *Ordination*: The first notion of that sense in expresse words in an approved Author is in *Hierome* upon *Isaiah* c. 58. where he saith *χειροτονίαν* esse ordinationem clericorum, quæ non solum ad imprecationem vocis sed ad impositionem impletur manus, *That Cheirotonia was the Ordination of Clerks, which*

is accomplish'd not only by the prayer of the voice, but also by the Imposition of hands. Which acception of the word in that sense seems first about those times to have been taken notice of, about those days when sundry tumults happening between the people themselves, and the people and the *Clergy* about the choice of *Bishops*, the people by the decree of the *Bishops* were prudently excluded from having or giving any voice any more in election of their *Bishop*. But the word *χειροτονια* remained still, being by them assumed, and in tract of time substituted and accommodated to their use in the sense of *Consecration*, or as we now call it, *Ordination*. In sum at least any should wrest my meaning, I have only to do with those, who would have *χειροτονουντες* in this individual place properly and by it self to signifie *καθιέροναι*, that is *solemn Ordination, by prayer, fasting and Imposition of hands*. This only I deny *χειροτονουντες* to signifie in this place. That these *Elders* whom the *Apostles* had chosen or appointed in several distant places were all consecrated with prayer and fasting in the several places where they were chosen, I do not deny but verily believe. Though these words in this place do not evince so much, as some have thought, who by the leave of blessed *S^t Chrysostom*, do not imprudently or incogitantly refer the prayers and fasting to the valediction

lediction of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and not to the constitution or appointing of *Elders*, as if that were only mentioned by the by, and that the sense should be according to the right construction, Thus, χειροτονήσαντες ὃ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρῃ κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, προσδύξαμενοι μετὰ νηστῶν παρέθεντο αὐτοὺς τῷ Κυρίῳ, Et cum constituissent illis per singulas ecclesias presbyteros, precati cum jejunio commendarunt eos domino, And when they had appointed them *Elders* in every Church, having prayed with fasting they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed. As if the prayers and fasting belonged to the farewell of the *Apostles*. Neither was such a farewell at all incongruous or unusual. Act. c. 20. v. 36. *Paul* being to take leave of the *Ephesians*, prayed with them all, and c. 21. v. 5. taking leave of the disciples in *Tyre*, he prayed with them kneeling on the shore. If they did also sometime at parting fast, it is a thing probable enough in a business which always was so solemn. Neither could the Ordination of *Elders* with prayers and fasting in every Church at *Derbe*, *Lystra*, *Antioch* and *Iconium* possibly be the work of one day and time, as is necessarily implied, if immediately after the Ordination, the *Apostles* commended them to the Lord and took their leaves, and so departed.

C. 15. v. 10. Νῦν οὖν τι παραΐχετε τῷ θεῷ ἰπιδείναι ζυγόν, &c. Nunc ergo quid tentatis

I 2

deum

Deum imponendo jugum cervici discipulorum? Now therefore why tempt ye God by putting a yoke on the necks of the disciples? The same manner of speech as is, τὸ ποιῆν ἔκθετα, *Act. c. 7. v. 19.*

V. 14. Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καὶ οὕτως πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπισκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, Symeon narravit quomodo Deus primo visitaverat, sumendo ex gentibus populum nomini suo, *Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit them, by taking out of the Gentiles a people for his name.* You must understand after ἐπισκέψατο, αὐτοῦς, *them*, that is the *Gentiles* mentioned, v. 7. λαβεῖν is the same phrase with that immediately before. It is an *elleiptical* kind of speech, and is to be supplied with some *Præposition* and the article τὸ as is most congruous to the sense, sometimes *ἐκ* sometimes *ἐν*, as *Act. c. 27. v. 1.* Ὡς ὃ ἐκείνη τὸ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμῶν, &c. That is *ἐν* τὸ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμῶν, *Ut autem decretum est de navigatione nostrâ in Italiam.* Or the like.

C. 16 v. 13. Ὁ οὐ νομιζέτο προσευχῆ ἐν, *Ubi domus orationis lege sancita est esse, Where a house of prayer was by the law appointed to be.* For νομίζω is properly, *lege sancio.* As for προσευχῆ it signifies in all probability in this place, *an oratory, or place of prayer*, as the *Syriack* and *Arabick* both interpret it, which was allowed it seems by the *Magistrates* of *Philippi*

lippi to the Jews that dwelt thereabout for the exercise of their devotions. So Josephus who was not long after Luke, if not contemporary with him, calls *μεγιστὴν οἰκὴν πολὺν ὄχλον ἐπιδέξασθαι δυνατόν*, *A great room capable to receive a multitude of people*, wherein they used to pray as is evident by the History. So you read in Philo against Flaccus, that the people of Alexandria cried out with one consent that the Images of Cæsar were to be set up ἐν ταῖς μεγιστοῖς, in the Oratories of the Jews: and in his Embassadge to Caius, that the people being gathered together in great multitudes τῶν μεγιστῶν, of the Jewish Oratories cut down some, demolish'd others, and others burn't, and πορευομένων ὅσας, as many Oratories as they could not burn, they vex't another way, by setting up in them the Statues of Caius. And indeed the word is familiar with him in this sense.

C. 17. v. 15. Οἱ δὲ καθίστοντες τὸ Παῦλον, Qui curam habebant Pauli, But they who had the care of Paul. Καθίστατο, ἐπιμελεῖτο, ἐφρόντιζεν, Phavor. or Qui disponebant Paulum, καθίσταμι, dispono, Gloss. Vet.

C. 18. v. 5. Σωείχετο τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Παῦλος, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τὸ καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, Constringebatur spiritu, i. e. Intus apud se æstuabat præ zeli ardore, Beza. But its nearer to the letter, to say, Tenebatur ani-

mo testificari Judæis Jesum esse ipsum Christum, *Paul was earnestly minded to testify unto the Jews that Jesus was the Christ.* As *συνέχεαι ἀποθυμία*, and *συνέχεαι φόβου* in *Chrysostom*, and *teneri desiderio* and *teneri metu* with the *Latins*, *διαμαρτυρόμεθα*, for *διαμαρτύρομαι*. The Particle is put for the *Infinitive* with words signifying any affection of the mind.

C. 19. v. 9. Ἐν τῇ πολλῇ τρυφῇ πνός. So reads *Rob. Steph.* and *Τρυφῇ*, with a great letter, as others. In *Schola alicujus civitatis principis*, *Disputing daily in the school of one of the Rulers of the city.* *Τρυφῇ*, ἐστὶν ἀρχῶν πόλεως. *Princeps Civitatis, Phavor.* And in this sense the *Aethiop.* and *Arab.* Interpreters seem to have understood it. The word is often used by the *Chald. Paraph. Jos. c. 13. v. 3.* and *Judg. c. 16.* in several places, instead of the *Hebren*, סרני, which the *LXX* render ἀρχοντες, reading סרני. We have the same very word likewise in the *LXX, Dan. c. 3. v. 2. Esth. c. 9. v. 3. Habak. c. 1. v. 10.* Neither if it were a proper name, is the word πνός, proper to be added. *Si nomen est proprium cur addit πνός, Eras.* Yet see *Zeger.* and *Grot.*

V. 21. Ἔθετο Παῦλ ἐν τῷ πνέματι, &c. *Paul resolved in his mind passing through Macedonia and Achaia to go to Jerusalem.* Ἔθετο, ἔπειρ, *Statui dicere, I was resolved to speak.* *Ælian.*

Ælian. de Animal. lib. 2. c. 11. πνδύμα is sometimes *animus*, as *Ezek. c. 20. v. 32.* Καὶ εἰ ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ τὸ πνδύμα ὑμῶν τῷτο, *And if this come into your mind.* So *c. 20. v. 22.* Καὶ νῦν ἰδὲ ἐγὼ δεδεμμένος εἰς τὸ πνδύμα πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *Et ecce ego nunc obstrictus animo proficiscor in Jerusalem, And behold I am now bound in my mind to go unto Jerusalem, that is, I am thoroughly resolved to go unto Jerusalem, though I know not the things that shall befall me there.*

C. 20. v. 8. Ἐν τῷ ὑπανώ, *In the upper Chamber, In canaculo, In the Room wherein they usually supped. In the Hebrew בערית. From the verb ערע, Ascendit. So ערע with Schindler is Superior pars domus, &c. The upper part of the house unto which they went by stairs, in which Anciently they were wont to sup, ὑπανώ. And so tis frequently Translated in the Old Testament by the Greek Interpreters, and canaculum by the Latins, Canacula dicuntur ad qua scalis ascenditur, Felt.*

C. 21. v. 16. Σωῆλδον ὃ καὶ ἔστι μνηστῆρς ἀπὸ Καισαρείας συν ἡμῖν ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενιοῦμεν Μνάσωνι τινι Κυπρίῳ ἀρχαίῳ μνηστῆρ. *You must necessarily understand οἱ or nives to agree with σωῆλδον and ἄγοντες. Venerunt simul cum nobis quidam ex discipulis à Cæsareâ ducentes ad Mnasonem quendam Cyprium, antiquum discipulum apud quem hospitaremur, And there came also together with us certain*

of the disciples from Casarea who conducted us to one Mnason a Cyprian an old disciple with whom we should lodge, Μνάσωνι for ὡς ἔστι Μνάσωνα, That is, to Mnasons house. To words that signifie motion to a place, the Dative is oftentimes put for the Accusative with a preposition. As, Οὐμὸς ἦν τὸ ἀέριον τῇ πόλει, for εἰς πόλιν. In the mean time I cannot but wonder that most Interpreters Translate adducentes secum Mnasonem, and brought with them one Mnason, when as it agrees neither with sense nor Grammar, It being much more probable that Mnason with whom they meant to lodge was at that time at Rome.

C. 24. v. 18. Ἐν οἷς, properly, Inter quæ, The which whilst I was doing, certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the Temple. You have the same phrase in the same sense, c. 26. v. 12. Ἐν οἷς καὶ πορεύομην, The which whilst I was doing, that is, whilst he was persecuting the Jews, v. 11. As he went to Damascus, &c. He saw a light from heaven, &c.

C. 26. v. 23. Οὐδὲν ἄλλως λέγων ὢν πρὸς φῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γινεῶς καὶ Μωσῆς, καὶ πατριῶς ὁ ἁγίος, εἰ ποῶται ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, &c. Saying nothing other then what the Prophets and Moses said should come to pass, if Christ was subject for to suffer, if he was the first from the Resurrection of the dead, &c. Si passibilis Christus, is the Translation of the Interlineary and the vulgar Latin, neither

can the *Greek* words admit any other. The *Jews* expected then, as still to this very day they do expect, a *Messias* whose Kingdom should be of this world, and so did the *Apostles* also at the first before his Resurrection, and therefore could by no means believe, that he could be subject unto Death or Passion. To root out which opinion out of their thoughts, *S^t Paul* would not have them perswaded barely by his word, but convinceth them by the Testimony of their own very Prophets; before *παιδιστος*, *lū* is to be understood.

C. 27. v. 21. *Τῷ ὕβρει τῶντων*, Hanc injuriam, commonly, *This harm*, but why not better, *this storm*, if it be true that *Suidas* saith, *ὕβρις, ὡς τὸ ὑερ βάρις*, *Eo quod pluatur pondus, or graviter, Because it raineth heavily, or grievously.* And we have in *Julius Pollux*, *ὕβρις ἀνεμῶ*, *Ventus insolens or procellosus, A boisterous or stormy wind.* And thus Translated the sense is altogether as good if not better, *Oportuit auscultasse mihi, & non solvisse à Creta, vitasse hanc tempestatem & jacturam, Te ought to have harkened unto me, and not to have loosed from Crete, and to have avoided this storm and loss.*

A N N O-

ANNOTATIONS

On the Ep.

To the Romans.

Ch. 1. v. 17.

Δ *Διαμοσών γδ θεῶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίσιν.* These words seem to be expounded with most significancy by trajection, *For the righteousness of God by Faith is in it revealed for Faith*, that is to be believed. As if it were written, *Διαμοσών γδ θεῶ ἐκ πίστεως ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται εἰς πίσιν.* That such trajections are very frequent I have shewed in sundry places, it is called, c. 3. 22. *Διαμοσών ὃ θεῶ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, The righteousness of God by Faith of or in Jesus Christ.* And in truth is the main purpose of this Epistle. As for the phrase *εἰς πίσιν*, it is used in the same sence immediately before, v. 5. *Ἔως ὑπακούω πίστεως, To or for the obedience of Faith*, that is, *that the Faith may be obeyed among all Nations*, as also, c. 15. 18. *Ἔως ὑπακούω ἐθνῶν, For the obe-*

obedience of the Gentiles, that is, that the Gentiles may be made obedient. Δυνάμει γὰρ θεῷ ἐστὶν [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.] εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, For the Gospel is the power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth, [there is εἰς πάντας] to the Jew first and also to the Greek, v. 16. So that it most fitly followes, For therein is the righteousness of God by Faith revealed that it may be believed, as it is written, Justus autem ex fide vivet, That he that is just by Faith, shall live, to wit, he shall inherit eternal life. For the Gospel is the power of God to save every one that believeth in his Son. You may see the like trajections, Act. 13. 27. 2 Cor. 4. 4. 1 Pet. 3. 21.

C. 2. v. 15. Τὸ ἔργον τῆ νομοῦ, Opus legis, The work of the law. The work or business of the law, is to accuse, or to excuse, and this is that conscience which is written in the hearts of all.

C. 3. v. 5, 6, 7. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν δεῖξις δικαιοσύνης σωίσηται, τί ἐρεμήσῃ ; μὴ ἀδικῶν ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφείων τὴν ὀργήν ; (κατ' ἀνθρώπων λέγω, μὴ γένοιτο ἐπεὶ πᾶς κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ;) εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια τῆ δεῖξις ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ φόβῳ ἐπε-
ρέσυσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἐπι καὶ ὡς ἀ-
μαρτωλῶν κρίνομεθα, καὶ μὴ (καὶ ὡς βλασφημί-
μεθα καὶ καὶ ὡς φασὶν οἱ ἄλλοι ἡμᾶς λέγειν) ὅτι
ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ; ὧν
τὸ κρίμα ἐνδοκον ἐστίν, Si vero iniquitas nostra
justi-

justitiam dei commendat, quid dicemus? Nonne injustus est Deus qui infert iram? (secundum hominem loquor, absit. Tum enim quomodo Deus judicabit mundum?) Si enim veritas dei in meo mendacio abundavit ad gloriam ipsius, quid ego tanquam peccator adhuc judicor & non (sicut blasphemamur, & sicut quidam nos aiunt dicere) quoniam fecerimus mala ut venirent bona? quorum iudicium justum est, *But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what shall we say? is not God unjust who inflicteth punishment? (I speak as a man, far be it. For then how shall God judge the world?) for if the truth of God through my falseness hath more abounded unto his glory, why am I yet judged as a sinner and not (as we are slanderously reported and as some affirm that we say) because we have done evil, that good might follow? whose judgment is just.* Most Interpreters do here omit the conjunction $\epsilon\pi\iota$, as *redundant*. But I conceive it is by no means to be pretermitted, for that it is the very word that explains the whole sense, which hitherto is very perplexed and obscure. The word $\ ποιήσωμεν$, which is commonly rendred in the *Imperative*, *Faciamus*, *Let us do*, I have Translated in the *subjunctive Aorist* in its proper sense together with the conjunction $\epsilon\pi\iota$, *quoniam fecerimus*, *because we have done*. The particle $\mu\eta$ I have Translated with *Grotius* in the *Interrogative Negative*.

Ep. to the Romans. 157

Negative, Nonne, is not? for so the sense requires, it being spoken carnally, or like a man, to charge God with injustice, and so you shall find the word to be taken, *Matth. c. 12. v. 23. Joh. c. 4. v. 29.* and elsewhere. Those words, κατ' ἀνθρώπων λέγω, &c. which divide the coherence, I have distinguished with a larger Parenthesis, that the connexion and inference of the sense may more easily appear, which is plainly thus, *For if our unrighteousness commends the righteousness of God what shall we say? is not God unjust who inflicteth punishment? for if the truth of God through my falseness hath more abounded unto his glory, why am I yet judged as a sinner, and not rather judged, because we have done evil that good might come, whose judgment that so judge is just.* For if they were called into judgment because they had done evil that good might come, κατ' ἀνθρώπων, according to man they might say, that God was unjust for punishing them as sinners, who had done nothing but what tended to his glory, and this judgment in their opinion is just. But if this should be granted, how should God judge the world? if with this plea the wicked might avoid his judgment, there would be none left to punish. And therefore the Apostle adds, *I speak as a man, according to the Sophistical argumentation of the Jews, or as Hierome saith, Secundum te qui talia sentis, According to*

to

158 *Annotations on the*

to thee who so thinkest. But far be it from our thoughts, for God cannot be unjust.

C. 5. v. 7. Ὑπὲρ γὰρ τῷ ἀγαθῷ πάντα τι καὶ
τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν, *For a righteous man scarce a-
ny man will die, but for a good man peradventure
some will dare to die.* Ἀγαθός in the Old Glos-
sary is *benignus*, and ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες with Sui-
das are σφοδρὰ πρὸς ἔλεον ῥέποντες, *ad miseri-
cordiam propensi, such as are very prone to
mercy.* And in Phavorinus ἀγαθός, is Ὁ χα-
ρις αὐτίσως τὰ καλὰ χαρίζομενος ἀφθονῶς,
*Qui non rogatus bona sua largitur citra in-
vidiam, Who bestows his goods unaskt without
grudging.* Ὁς χαριῶν ἀφθονὰ πάντα νέμει, *as
Theocritus saith of Menalcas.* So that, *Good*,
is a complex word that hath several meanings,
it signifieth, *Courteous or kind, merciful or li-
beral*, and such is a friend in all respects,
and for such a friend perhaps some would dare
to die, as some rare examples tell us; or per-
haps *Good* may be taken here as personally
good to such a man, and such a one is pro-
perly a friend. Let a man be never so just
or righteous, there's none will lay down his
life for him, but for such a one as hath been
good to me, as my friend hath been, perhaps
for such a one I shall dare to die, and far-
ther reacheth not the love of man. Μείζονα
ταύτης ἀγαπῶν εἰς εἶς ἔχει, &c. *No man hath
Greater love then this, that he lay down his
life for his friend, Joh. c. 15. v. 13.* But

God

Ep. to the Romans. 159

God commendeth his love to us, in that while we were yet sinners, that is enemies, Christ died for us. This is the love which exceedeth knowledge, Eph. c. 3. v. 19.

V. 12, 13, 14. &c. Διὰ τὸ τοῦ ὡς περ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸ κῆσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ ἕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Ἀχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ὡς ἐν τῷ κῆσμῳ ἁμαρτία ᾧ ἔστι ἐλλογέται μὴ ὄντος νόμου, ἀλλ' ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωσέως, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀμνιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ, ὅς ἐστι πᾶσι τοῖς μέλλουσιν. In most Interpreters you have in this place an *Anantopodoton*, that is a deficiency in the reddition of the sense, a *sicut* without a *sic*, which ought by all means to be avoided, if without violence to the Text it possibly may. Nor can I assent to those who to prevent the inconvenience of an *Anantopodosis* would have the 18 and 19 verses answer to the 12. which seems to me too constrainedly forc'd. I rather approve their judgments who Translate καὶ ἕτως, by a frequent *Metathesis*, ita quoque, so also, as the Old Latin Interpreter of Chrysostom; the Syriack and Arabick read, or etiam ita, even so, by which version there is no wrong either to the construction or the sense, but all is whole taking καὶ only in the *reditive* and not in the *copulative* sense, as it is
in

in the Lords prayer, 'Ὡς ἐν ἡραν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ γῆς, Ut in coelo etiam in terra. Ὡς περ διὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, &c. Καὶ ὅτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, &c. Propterea sicut per unum hominem peccatum in mundum introiit, & per peccatum mors, etiam ita mors in omnes homines pertransiit eo quod omnes peccaverunt, *Therefore as by one man sin entred into the world, and by sin death, even so death passeth upon all men; for that all have sinned. For until the Law, that is, before the Law sin was in the world.* That sin was in the world before the Law, seems to be the main thing that the *Apostle* here laboureth to prove, that he might meet with the tacite or implied objection of those who probably did deny that all men were sinners and the enemies of *God*, as he had before affirmed, v. 8. and therefore did *Sophistically* argue, that *Christ* died not for all, because sin is the transgression of the Law, but they which had no Law, could not transgress that which they had not, for the Law was from *Moses*, Joh. c. i. v. 17. To meet therefore with their objection, he useth this argument, *As by one man sin entred into the world and by sin death, &c. τῶτο*, For this very reason, *Even so is death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, none excepted.* So that it appears most certainly true that from the fall of *Adam* to the Law given by *Moses*, for he speaks of no other Law through-

out

Ep. to the Romans. 161

out the whole Epistle, sin was in the world.
But it is farther objected, that sin is not imputed where there is no Law, for *the Law worketh wrath*, c. 4. v. 5. To which he gives no other answer, but an implicit one, the same in effect which he gave before, *Immo*, for so *ἄρα* I conceive is to be rendred here, *Regnavit mors ab Adam, &c. Yea death reigned from Adam to Moses*, therefore was sin not only in the world before the Law, but also imputed before the Law. Their dying was an argument not only that they had sinned, but that also their sin was imputed, for *the wages of sin is death*, and therefore because death hath passed on all men, its necessarily determined that all have sinned, and so become obnoxious to the punishment of death, even they who had *not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression*, for death reigned on very Infants, who sinned not actually, as Adam did, *ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, that is, *ἀνθρώπου*, *who is the type of man to come*, to wit, *of all mankind*. For Adam did in his person represent all the Race of men which were to spring from his loyns. And in this regard and sense Adam seems to me most fitly to be stiled in this place, *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, *The type of man which is to come*. I acknowledge all Interpreters elder and later understand Christ to be him that was to come, but I see no cogency in the Text to bind

M

my

my Faith to that interpretation, but rather arguments to dissuade it. For truly if we speak in a proper sense, *Adam* cannot be said to be the type of *Christ*. For a type is the express Image or Figure of the thing it represents, *τύπος* respondet *τύμ* *τύσαντι*, ut sigillo cera, the type answereth to the antitype, as the wax unto the seal. It is absolutely necessary that the type of that which is good be good it self, and the type of that which is evil must be evil, otherwise it cannot be a type. It is the sence of *Chrysostom* in his Comment on the Epistle to the Hebrews, c. 9. v. 23. Neither is there any will say that *Adam* is a true and proper type of *Christ*, but that he is so only per antithesim, or analogiam, by opposition of contraries, or proportion, or by some intricate distinction, such as is that of *Origen's*, *Juxta genus constare similitudinem, juxta speciem repugnantiam esse*, That there is a similitude as to the Genus, a repugnancy as to the species, Whereas *Adam* is properly, truly and significantly, I may add aptly and appositly to this place, said to be the type of his off-spring which was to come from his loins, and which he did so virtually represent in his person, as that by his sin they all became obnoxious to sin and death. And from these words thus expounded is formed as strong an argument for *Original sin* as from any Text of Scripture. Neither do I seem to be altogether without witness

Ep. to the Romans. 163

I have the *Aethiopick Version* or *Paraphrase* for me. The words whereof in *Latin* are these. *V*eruntamen dominata est mors propterea ab Adamo usque ad Mosem, tam in iis qui peccaverunt, quem in iis qui non peccaverunt, per illud peccatum Adami, eo quod unusquisque in similitudine Adami creatus est, & quia Adamus typus fuit illius qui erat venturus, *Nevertheless death reigned therefore from Adam to Moses, as well in those that sinned, as also in those that sinned not, by that sin of Adam, because that every one is born in the likeness of Adam, and because Adam was the type of him that was to come.* From which words I could make no other construction, but that he plainly means that death did reign over all by the sin of *Adam*, for these two causes, because every one was born, in the likeness of *Adam*, and because *Adam* was the type of him who was to come. Both which reasons seem to me one and the same, the one being a *red-dition* or *explication* only of the other, it being all one to say, that *Adam* was a type of his Posterity, and that *Adam's* Posterity was born in his likeness. But to say that death reigned over all by the sin of *Adam* because *Adam* was the type of *Christ*, is surely an inconsequent argument. Whereas to affirm, that death reigned over all by the sin of *Adam*, because *Adam* was a type that represented all his Posterity, methinks, answers fitly to the

M 2

place,

place, and is very easie for the lowest capacity at first sight to apprehend.

C. 6. v. 4. *Christ is said to be raised from the dead, Διὰ τὴν δόξην τοῦ πατρὸς, By the glory of the Father, as it is commonly rendred. Beza would have it, In gloriam Patris, & being put for εἰς, For the glory of the Father. The Translation either way is harsh. Why may it not be much better rendred by a familiar trajection? Per Patrem gloriae, By the Father of glory, which is significant and apt, as he is elsewhere called Dominus gloriae, and Deus gloriae, The Lord of glory, and the God of glory. And so is he expressly called, Eph. c. 1. v. 17. Ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, Pater gloriae, The Father of glory.*

C 7. v. 24. *Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπου· τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου, O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? Or as it is in our margin from this body of death? And why not, O wretched man that I am who shall deliver me from the death of this body? that is thus captivated under the Law of sin which is in its members, v. 23. And so the sense without any Metaphor is plain and suitable to the scope of the place. There being nothing more familiar then such trajections. Examples whereof you may see, Heb. c. 7. v. 4. Jam. c. 2. v. 1. c. 3. v. 3. 1 Pet. c. 3. v. 21. 2 Pet. c. 1. v. 19. You have one in the margin of this very place.*

Ep. to the Romans. 165

V. 25. 'Ευχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. These words are to be supplied out of the former, whereto they are a perfect answer. The Apostles trembling question was, *Who shall deliver me from the death of this body, that is such a slave to sin?* to which he forthwith answers, *I thank God he will deliver me, through Jesus Christ, αὐτὸς με ῥύσεται*, being to be understood, as a reddition to the question.

C. 8. v. 3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδυνάτων τῷ νόμῳ ἐν ᾧ ᾤοντο διὰ τὴν σαρκὸς, ὁ Θεός, &c. I cannot see how there can be construction here but by a *Metathesis*, 'Εν ᾧ γὰρ τὸ ἀδυνάτων τῷ νόμῳ ᾤοντο, &c. *Eo enim quod impotentia legis debilis erat propter carnem, Deus filium suum mittens, &c. For in that the weakness of the Law was impotent because of the flesh, God sending his own Son, &c.*

C. 9. v. 10, 11. 'Επαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἔσται, Κατα τὴν κληρὸν τῶν ἐλδούσμων, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρει ὡς, ὅ μόνον ὃ ἀλλὰ καὶ 'Ρεβέκκα ἐξ ἑνὸς κοιλίῳ ἔχουσιν Ἰσραὴλ τὸ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, &c. ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ, &c. To reconcile the sense and construction of these words wherein there hath been so much labour, you must understand the verb *ᾤοντο* before the participle *ἔχουσιν*, by an *Hebraism* or *Gracism* frequent in every Page almost in Holy Writ. Whereof see note on *Mar. c. 12. v. 40.* *Promissionis enim verbum hoc est, secundum tem-*

pus hoc veniam & erit Saræ filius, non solum vero, sed & Rebecca ex altero erat gravida ex Isaac patre nostro, nondum enim natis, &c. Dictum est ei, major serviet minori, *For this is the word of promise. At this time I will come, and Sara shall have a son, and not only so, but Rebecca also by another was with child by our Father Isaac, For the children being not yet born, &c. It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.* As much as to say, that Rebecca was with child also by another word of promise, ἐξ ἐνόου, relating to ἐπαγγελίας ὁ λόγος. Κοιτῶν ἦν ἐχουσα τῷ Ἰσαὰκ, I conceive to be a more proper phrase, then ἐξ Ἰσαὰκ, For if a man be said κριτῶ διδόναι ἐν γυναικί, Numb. c. 5. v. 20. then is it rightly said Ῥεβέκκα ὡς ἐχουσα κριτῶ τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἰσαὰκ, Rebecca retinuit semen patris nostri Isaac, that is, concepit, *she was with child by her Father Isaac.* So that there was not such necessity for the learned Beza to pronounce so positively, Est itaque depravatus hic locus a quopiam Græcæ linguæ prorsus ignaro, *This place is depraved by some person ignorant of the Greek tongue.* When as so easie and frequent a remedy is at hand. Κατὰ τὴν ἡμερὴν τῶτον, According to this time, are the words of the LXX, whom Paul it seems did follow, and they questionless read ἡμερὴν instead of ἡμέραν, and so rendred it τὴν ἡμερὴν τῶτον, *this time, for τὴν ἡμερὴν τὴν ζώντων, the time*

Ep. to the Romans. 167

time of life, according as it is Gen. c. 18. v. 10. and 14. כִּעַן חַיָּה, Secundum or circa tempus vitæ, At or about the time of life I will return unto thee. And I suspect it is not rightly read in the Hebrew it self, Gen. c. 17. v. 21. הַיּוֹם, at this time, which should have been rather written conformably with the other places, relating to this story, חַיָּה, at the time of life. As for the word *ἑνός* in our sense, it is abundantly familiar, The LXX use it for, ἄλλο altero, another, Gen. c. 43. v. 13. Psal. 108. v. 14. You shall find it likewise in the same sense, 1 Cor. c. 4. v. 6. and in Dioscor, and Greg. Nazian. take but the pains to look in Steph. Thes.

V. 22. Ἐἰς δὲ δέλων ὁ θεός, &c. Here is no necessity for Anantopodosis, the coherence of the place is plain and ready, distinguish but the words aright, *Nay but O man who art thou that repliest against God, if God being willing to shew his wrath and to make his power known hath endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction? The intervenient words, Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the Potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour? being all to be included in a Parenthesis.* Thus Μενοῦντος ὡς ἀνθρώπου σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος. τῷ θεῷ (μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι, τί με ἐποίησας ὕψως;

ἢ ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμὸς τῷ πηλῷ, ὡς τῷ αὐτῷ φεράματι ποιῶσι, ὁ μὲν εἰς πηλὸν σκῶν, ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀπημίαν;) εἰ δὲ θεῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τῷ ὀργῶν, καὶ γνωρίσαι τοῦ διωκτοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἡνέκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκώη ὀργῆς καταπραΰναι εἰς ἀπώλειαν; &c. The *Conjunction* δὲ before θεῶν, is *expletive*, as is usual.

C. 10. v. 16. Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπακούσαν, Sed nulli obedierunt Evangelio, *But none have obeyed the Gospel.* For *Esaias* saith, *Who hath believed our report?* plainly intimating not any, or scarce any had believed. The phrase is familiar, *Act. c. 10. v. 25.* Οὐκέτι ὄψασθαι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὑμεῖς πάντες, *None of you shall see my face any more.* *1 Cor. c. 1. v. 29.* Μηδὲ πᾶσα σὰρξ, &c. *That no flesh should glory.* And so frequently in the *Old Testament*, and elsewhere in the *New*.

C. 11. v. 21. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων ὅτι ἐφείσται, μή τις εὐδὲ σὺ φείσεται. What need is there of any supplement? For it is ὀρθῶς rightly spoken according to the use of speaking with the LXX *μηπως* forte, *perhaps.* For if God spared not the natural branches perhaps he will neither spare thee. See *2 Tim. c. 2. v. 25.*

C. 12. v. 19. Ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ, But give place unto vengeance, that is to the minister of God who is ἐκδικᾶν εἰς ὀργῶν, the avenger to punish him that doeth evil, c. 13.

Ep. to the Romans. 169

v. 4. So frequently in the *Old Testament*, where *God* is meant to be avenged of his people, it is said *Καὶ ὀργὴ τῷ θεῷ ἀνέβη ἐπ' αὐτούς*, *And the wrath, that is, the vengeance of God came upon them*, *Psal.* 78. v. 31. † So *Rom.* c. 3. v. 5. *Ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργὴν*, we Translate, *Who taketh vengeance*. But we ought by no means to give place unto anger, *Eph.* c. 4. v. 26. *Be ye angry and sin not, let not the sun go down upon your wrath*, *Μὴτε δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ*, *Neither give place to the Devil*, that is, *to the passion of anger*. So *Plutarch*, *Περὶ ἀοργησίας*· δεῖ δ' οὐ μὴτε παύζονταί τῇ ὀργῇ διδόναι τόπον, *We ought not to give place to wrath no not in jest or play*.

C. 14. v. 1. *Μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν*, *Infirmum fide assumite non ad dijudicationes cogitationum*, *Him that is weak in the Faith receive, not to judge of his inward thoughts*. By a frequent phrase, such as is *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως*, c. 1. v. 5. and *εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν*, c. 15. v. 18. In which sense that these words are to be understood the following declare. *Tu quis es qui judicas alienum servum? Who art thou that judgest another mans servant? Temerarias censuras prohibet Apostolus*, *The Apostle forbids rash censures*, saith *S^t Hierome*. As if he should say, *Him that is weak in the Faith receive into your fellowship, but not to discriminate or judge his private opinions, if perhaps out of the weakness of his judgment* he

he thinketh otherwise then ye do. For one believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not, and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth. Neither is that Translation, which renders, *To doubtful disputations*, very significant, besides that it is unusual. For διαλογισμὸς in the Old and New Testament is for the most part taken, *Pro cogitatione hominis secum ratiocinantis*, For the thought of a man reasoning within himself. As Stephanus hath well observed.

C. 16. v. 25. Τῷ δὲ δυνάμει, &c. But to him that is of power to establish you according to my Gospel, &c. Why this Doxology is annexed now a days to the end of this Chapter, I cannot but wonder at, when tis confest almost by all, that these verses, to wit, the 25, 26, 27, are found in all ancient copies, as they do also remain in the Greek Fathers, written in the end of the 14 chapter, after those words, *Whatsoever is not of Faith, is sin*, except the Alexandrian transcript, which (perhaps out of abundant caution) reads it in both places. As far as I can conjecture of this matter, it seems to me to be thus. There was a common opinion which possibly from Hieroms words upon this place was derived to posterity, that Marcion the Hæretique did rase or cut out all the 15 and

Ep. to the Romans. 171

and 16 Chapters because they thwarted his opinion, and that he might the better cover his fraud, placed this *Doxology* at the end of c. 14. because he would have had the Epistle to end there. But I do very much doubt that this was ever done by him, though I will not question but he endeavoured to rase out all the rest. I rather believe that the *Orthodox Christians* of those times and their followers, induced with this opinion out of their zeal to meet with *Marcion*, did purposely remove this *Doxology* from the end of c. 14. where it was not fixed by the fraud of *Marcion*, but by the *Apostle* himself, to the end of c. 16. that so they might include all which *Marcion* would have rased out. I say they removed it from its proper place for this cause, for I cannot conjecture for what other reason they should do it. Was it because *Doxologies* were more commodious in the end of an Epistle? surely no. For *Eph.* c. 3. v. 20, 21. there is the same *Doxology* in the middle, and *Gal.* c. 1. v. 5. and *1 Tim.* c. 1. v. 17. there is the like in the beginning, and so in divers other places scattering through *Pauls* Epistles, but none in the end of any, where it was his solemn custom to use another *Epilogue*, which was his *signe in every Epistle*, So I write, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all, Amen.* Or was it because this *Doxology* was more extraor-

traordinarily fit and proper for the end of the Epistle? surely no. For it hath no coherence at all with the precedent matter, but it suits and agreeth most exactly well with the end of c. 14. where when the Apostle had through the whole chapter almost discoursed of the danger of a doubting mind, most fitly follows this *Doxology*, *Τῷ ᾧ δυνάμει, &c.* But to him that hath power to establish you, &c. be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. So Chrysostom and other Greek Interpreters have observed on this place, "Εὐχὰς αἰεὶ τῷ Παύλῳ εἰς εὐχὰς καὶ δοξολογίας κατακλείειν τὴν ᾠδὴν, *It was the custom of Paul to close his exhortations with prayers and Doxologies.* Since therefore the cause is ceased, and almost all knowledge at least remembrance of it, for which these verses were perhaps with a pious zeal at first removed to the end of c. 16. that they might reinclude all that *Marcion* would have expung'd, I conceive he shall commit no offence, but rather do a grateful service, who ever shall remit them to their proper place at the end of c. 14. After those words, Πᾶν ᾧ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ πίστεως, ἀμαρτία ἐστίν.

ANN O.

ANNOTATIONS

On the I. Ep. To

The Corinthians.

Ch. 2. v. 2.

OΥΔ ἔχοντα τὸ εἰδέναι τί ἐν ὑμῖν εἴ
 μὴ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, &c. Non enim
 decreveram scire quicquam inter vos
 nisi Jesum Christum eumque cru-
 cifixum, *For I determined not to know any thing*
among you but Jesus Christ and him crucified.
 But to confess my ignorance, I profess, I do
 not comprehend the meaning of this expres-
 sion, I had rather thought the *Apostle* in-
 tended to tell the *Corinthians*, what was ne-
 cessary for them to know, and not for him-
 self. Some therefore seeking to avoid the
 inconvenience of this phrase, would have εἰ-
 δέναι, to signifie, κηρύττειν, *to preach or to de-*
clare, but that signification is surely strain'd
 too far from the genuine sense and common
 use of the word to deserve acceptance. That
 the interpretation may be fitted to a better
 sense

174 Annotations on the

sense, the use of words and Grammatical construction, I think we may more rightly say, that ἐν ὑμῖν is an *elleiptical* expression instead of, τοῖς ἐν ὑμῖν, like to that in the *Hebrew*, *Habak.* c. 1. v. 5. as it is usually read and Translated וַיַּרְא בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *Videte intergentes, Behold among the Heathen*, that is, *ye who are among the Heathen*, or *behold ye Heathen*. Or in *Luk.* c. 21. v. 16. Καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, *And some of you shall they cause to be put to death*. Or *Joh.* c. 6. v. 17. Ἐἶπον οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, *Dixerunt ergo discipuli*, as the *Old Latin*, *Then said some of his disciples*. And so we may render it with very good sense, *Non enim decrevi eos qui inter vos sunt aliquid scire, nisi Jesum Christum eumque crucifixum, For I determined not, that you or those that are among you should know any thing but Jesus Christ and him crucified*. And therefore he saith, *He came not with excellency of speech, or wisdom, but in weakness and in fear, not with the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the demonstration of the spirit and of power*.

V. 6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τέλει, *Sapientiam loquimur in perfectis, We speak wisdom in things that are perfect*. He speaks not of persons, meaning the *Corinthians*, whom in the following chapter v. 1. he calls *babes in Christ*, so far were they distant from perfection, but rather in *things that are holy*

I. Ep. to the Corinthians, 175

or sacred. For *τίλεια* are *ἱερα*, and *πλειώσεις*, *ἀγιάσεις*, *Hesych.* and *Phavor.* So *Heb.* c. 2. v. 10. *πλειώσῃ* and *ἀγιάζειν*, to make perfect and to sanctifie or consecrate, are all one. It is a manner of speech peculiar to this place. My speech and my preaching was not *ἐν παιδοῖς* in the persuasive words of humane wisdom, but *ἐν ἀποδείξει* in the demonstration of the spirit. We speak wisdom *ἐν τείλει* in things sacred or holy, *ἐν μυστηρίῳ*, in a mystery, *ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου*, in words taught of the holy spirit. Through the whole series of his discourse in this chapter there is no mention of to whom he spake, but of what or how he spake, to wit of things sacred and mysterious, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entred into the heart of man, v. 9. *πνευματρὸς δυνάμει* à *Dionysio* vocatur *vis divina operans in sacris Ecclesiasticis.* *πλειῶ*, *sacro & consacro*; *πλειῶν* *Greg. Naz.* appellat *baptismum*, *πλειωτὶς ὁ βαπτιστὴς*, *Idem.* *τίλεια* etiam *ἱερά* dicebant *eximia* vel *sanctiora* vel *Iusta*, *Bud. com. ling. Græ. p. 624. 625.* *Καθ' ἱερῶν πλειῶν*, was with the *Athenians*, *ὁ νόμιμος ὄρκος*, the lawful oath, *Andocides* in the same place.

C. 3. v. 12, 13, &c. *Ἐὰν τις οἰκοδομῇ, &c.* The sense of this place is this. If any Minister of the Gospel shall build upon this foundation, which is *Iesus Christ*, gold, silver, or pretious stones, that is, a pure, solid, and stable

stable doctrine, concerning the Faith of *Christ*, or *hay*, *wood*, and *stubble*, that is, a frail, fading and temporary doctrine, what ever it be, *the day shall declare it*, when the fire of trial cometh, what every mans work is, τὸ πῦρ δι-
 υργῶς, *the fire of persecution shall try*. In that day they who were builded on the pure and solid doctrine of Faith, shall remain stedfast, and so the Minister shall receive his reward, to wit, the perseverance of his disciples, but they who were faintly rooted in the Faith, when the trial of persecution cometh, immediately fall away and become *Apostates* from the Faith, and so that Minister shall suffer loss, he shall lose his labour and the reward of his pains, but he himself shall be saved, Οὐτω δὲ ὡς ἁγ' πυρὸς, *But so as he pass through the fire of persecution with constancy and steddiness to the Faith himself*. Upon this account it was, that *S^t John*, after he had forewarned the *Elect Lady* and *her Children*, of the deceivers and the *Antichrist* who were entred into the world, gives them this farther caution, 2 Ep. v. 8. βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς, ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσωμεν ἃ ἐργασάμεθα, ἀλλ' ἃ μισθὸν πληρὸν ἀπολάβωμεν, *Videte vosmetipsos, ne perdamus quæ operati sumus, sed ut mercedem plenam accipiamus*, *Look to your selves, that we loose not those things which we have wrought, but that we may receive a full reward*. Not as in the *Vulgar Latin* and some *Greek* co-
 pies,

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 177

pies, *διπλόησθε, ἐργάσασθε*, and *διπλαῖσθε*, *Videte vosmetipsos, ne perdati quæ operati estis, sed ut mercedem plenam accipiat. Whereby the allusion to S^t Paul is wholly lost. See Philip. c. 2. v. 16. Λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες, Verbum vitæ firmiter tenentes, Holding fast the word of life, Ut gloriari possim in die Christi, That I may glory in the day of Christ. Behold the reward of Paul, the perseverance of the Philippians in the word of life.*

C. 4. v. 3. Ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας. *Litterally, of mans day, but the sense is the Judgment of man. In our language we call him a Days man, that is chosen an Umpire to judge between party and party, probably from the Latin phrase, à dicendo diem, from appointing a day in which the Days man was to give his judgement.*

C. 5. v. 13. Τί γάρ μοι καὶ τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν; ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε; τοὺς δὲ ἔξω ὁ Θεὸς κρίνει, καὶ ἐξαοῖτε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, *Quid enim mihi de iis qui foris sunt judicare? Nonne de iis qui intus sunt vos judicatis? eos vero qui foris sunt judicat Deus. Tolle ergo sceleratum istum ex vobis ipsis. For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? but them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among you that wicked person. This reading and Translation do neither agree with the context nor with the scope*

N

of

of the *Apostle*, whose main business is in this Chapter to reprove the *Corinthians* because they had not judged the incestuous person, who was a brother and within the Church, as they ought to have done; and in the next, because they had no Judgment seats at all, Whereas by this question [*do ye not judge those that are within?*] is implicitly granted, that they were not to be blamed at all for their slackness in this duty. That therefore we may reconcile the coherence of the Text, and the *Apostle* to himself, and the meaning of the place may be made somewhat plainer then hitherto it is, We must first alter the points, as *Theophylact* doth witness some did before his time, and then the reading in a *letter*, and an *accent*, and that not without Authority, for so *Theodoret* did read, τὸ πονηρὸν, *the evil*, for τὸ πονηρὸν, *the evil person*, and κεῖναι shall judge, for κεῖναι judgeth. And so reads the *Greek edition of Aldus* prepared by *Asulanus* and set out in print 1518. And so doth the *Old Latin* read *judicabit* for *judicat*, and *malum* I suppose in the *Neuter gender*. Thus, Τί γὰρ μὴ καὶ τοὶ ἐξω κεῖναι ἐξ ὧν ὑμεῖς κεῖναι, τοὶ δὲ ἐξω ὁ θεὸς κεῖναι, καὶ ἐξαρεῖν τὸ πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτοῦ. Quid enim mihi eos qui foris sunt judicare? Non omnino. Eos qui intus sunt judicabit Deus, & tolletis malum è vobis, *For what have*

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 179

to do to judge them that are without? Not at all. Judge ye those that are within, but those that are without God will judge, and ye shall take away the evil from among you. As if he should say, It concerns not us at all to judge those that are without the Church, do ye your duty in judging those that are within it, and so doing ye shall take away the evil from among your selves, that is, ye shall not be guilty of the evil; but as for those that are out of the Church, its fitting for you to leave them to the Judgment of God. And to speak the truth, as το πορνεον, the evil, in the Neuter gender, doth very well suit with the scope of this place, so doth it with the use of the phrase in the Old Testament, from whence without doubt the Apostle borrowed it. So Chrysostom on the place, Εμνημόνευσε τὴν ῥήσεως ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ, Meminit dictionis in Veteri, He remembered the phrase in the Old Testament, and so Theodoret, Μωσαϊκῶν πθεκε μαρτυρίαν, Mosaicum apposuit Testimonium, He put to the Testimony of Moses. But that this phrase will bear no other reading or sense in the Old Testament, but in the Neuter gender, will evidently appear to those who shall diligently examine the circumstances of the places, wherever they find it. For example, where is mention made of the Damoel on whom her virginity was not found, Deut. c. 22. v. 21. She shall be stoned

N z

with

with stones that she die. Καὶ ἐξαρείς τὸ πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, So shalt thou put away the evil from among you, that is, the guilt of the evil, as Deut. c. 21. v. 9. And he that is but a smatterer in Greek, will presently discern it to be a fault in the Roman edition of the LXX, which renders in this place τὸ πονηρὸν in the Masculine gender, as also in the 22. and 24. verses of the same chapter, in both which places the same reading is altogether as incongruous, though it was prudently forborn in our new Poliglott Bibles from the emendation of it, least the Romanists should from thence have taken occasion to cavil with our Edition for corrupting of their copy.

C. 6. v. 1. Πᾶγμα ἔχων, Negotium habens, Having a matter, that is, litem, a controversy, suite or action against another, so as it might more properly and significantly be rendred, having a suite or action against another, in which sense πᾶγμα is frequently understood with the Greeks, as is negotium also with the Latins.

V. 2. Ἀνάξιοι ἐστὶ κρινεῖν ἐλαχίστων; Indigni estis ut de minimis judicetis? As the vulgar Latin. Are ye unworthy to judge of the smallest matters? But this Translation is not adequate to the words. Beza seems to go somewhat nearer. Indigni estis minimis iudiciis? But neither is that plain. For the A-

posse

I. Ep. to the Corinthians, 181

postle intends not the *act* of Judgment, but the *place*. And therefore it would be more fitly rendred according to the force of the word, *Indigni estis minimis subselliis*? Are ye unworthy of the least places of judicature? For *κειμελιον* in no Author signifies the *act* of Judgment, but the *Bench* or *Seat* where Judgment is given, the same with *δικαστηριον*, in which sense tis used, *Jud. c. 5. v. 9. Dan. c. 7. v. 10. Susa. v. 49. Jam. c. 2. v. 6.* As if he should have said, What? Are ye who shall sit on Thrones (as it is in another place) judging the Twelve tribes of Israel, unworthy of the smallest seats of Judgment here? Subsella are called the seats of Judicature, in which Judgments are given of the smallest matters, according to *Asconius*.

V. 4. *Εἰσπείτε μὴ ὡς κειμελια, &c.* The common version suites neither with the custom of speech among the Greeks, with construction, or with sense. *Secularia igitur judicia si habeatis, contemptibiles qui sunt in Ecclesiâ, illos constituite ad judicandum, If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed of the Church.* Where by the word *κειμελια*, *judicia, judgments*, the Interpreters seem to understand *suits at Law*, but as I told you in the former animadversion, *κειμελιον*, in no Author signifies any such thing as a *suit at Law*. If they say, they mean *Judgment seats*,

their language is not clear, and besides they then plainly affirm, that which the *Apostle* positively denies, who reproves them for that very cause, for that they had none, but would be judged rather by *Infidels*. And if this were granted the inference is not so suitable to sense and reason, but that there may be cause enough *μεχευ*, to suspend a mans assent, and to enquire further into the truth of the Translation. Which I conceive with the leave of *Antiquity* may be very easily restored into a more commodious sense and Syntax, thus, only varying the points, Βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια, εἰς ἃν ἔρχηται τοὺς ἐξουδενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τούτοις, καθίστη, Secularia igitur subsellia, si habeatis hos contemptibiles in Ecclesiâ, constituite, Set ye up therefore secular Judgment seats, if ye account these persons contemptible in the Church. As if he should say, What will ye go to Law before the Infidels, who cannot but be despicable to the Church, in that they are no part of it? Will ye suffer the unjust and wicked to judge between you, whom ye your selves shall one day judge? Are ye ignorant that ye shall Judge the very Angels? How much more worthy then are ye of these petty seats of Judgment? Appoint ye therefore Judges among your selves, Set up some Judgment seats, I speak unto your shame, is it so, that there is not a wise man among you, not one who can judge between brother

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 183

ther and brother, but that you go to Law with one another and that before the unbelievers? Far is it from the *Apostle* to bid them place contemptible Persons in the seat of Judgment. Nothing less, He reproves and checks them, that they should think so meanly of themselves, as to appeal to the Courts of *Infidels*, as though there were not a wise man among themselves, who might be judge among them. Surely by that very speech severely intimating, that he ought to be a wise man and no contemptible person, who should have the Authority to be Judge in the Church. And in contradiction to this Interpretation there is not one thing can be properly objected, the sense, the grammar, and form of speech so perfectly agreeing, whereas there are so apparent Solecismes in the other, as are not to be by any art reconciled. For besides that *κρείττερον* was never used in that sense, as it is here commonly taken, the phrase *τὸς τούτοις καὶ δίδεκεν*, is extremely harsh and insolent, not to be salved with an *Hebraism*. For if it were a true *Hebraism*, it should be read, *τὸς ἐξ ἐθενημένος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ δίδεκεν*, and not *τούτοις*. As to the phrase, *καὶ δίδειν κρείττερον*, it is the same with *τὸ καὶ δίδειν διακρίνον* in *Aristophanes* and *Libanius*. But the inveterate opinion is more deeply rooted, then to be removed without some Magisterial Authority, or else a supine negligence hath prevailed

vailed over us. And indeed the same fate is common to prophane Authors, else how is it possible, so stupid or irrational a version should still pass unobserved by Interpreters, to this very day, and that in a place of moment, in the very entrance of *Ptolomy*, in the very definition of *Geography*, unless men were blinded by some fate, seduced into error by the unhappy connexion of two words together, by reading of διαγραφῆς, *in one word*, for δ'αγραφῆς, *in two*. Ἡ γεωγραφία μίμησις ἐστὶ διαγραφῆς τῆ κατεληλυμμένης τῆ γῆς μέρους ὅλης, *Geographia est imitatio picturæ totius partis terræ cognitæ, Geography is an imitation of the picture of all that part of the earth which is known.* A definition surely absurd and insignificant. Whereas it ought without all question to be read and Translated, Thus, Ἡ γεωγραφία μίμησις ἐστὶ δ'αγραφῆς τῆ κατεληλυμμένης, &c. *Geographia est imitatio totius partis terræ cognitæ per picturam, per descriptionem, or in tabula, Geography is an imitation of all that part of the earth which is known, by picture, description, or map.* The very name of *Geography*, signifying nothing else but a *description of the earth*.

C. 7. v. 14. Ἠγίασαι γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἠγίασαι ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ἐπεὶ ἅρα πᾶν πᾶνα ὑμῶν ἀγαθὰ ἔστι, νῦν δ' ἀγία ἐστίν, *For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, [that is the believing*

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 185

lieving wife] *and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband* [that is the believing husband] else, unless one of the Parents were a believer, *your children were unclean*, that is *remain heathen*, as ἀγῶταρτ is in other places understood; but now [because one of the Parents is a believer] *are your children holy*, that is reputed *members of the Christian Church*. And in this sense doth the *Apostle* often use the word ἅγιος, as in the beginning of this *Epistle*, Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ διὰ τῆς ἑσθῆς ἐν Κορινθῷ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, *To the Church of God which is in Corinth, that are called Saints*, Not that all who were in the Church of Corinth were real Saints, but because they were reputed members of the Church, therefore were they called Saints. And for that cause the children of that Parent that was κλητός ἅγιος, *called a Saint*, or reputed a believer, were reputed Saints and holy also, and consequently admitted to the participation of *Baptism*, as the son of a *Proselyte* was capable of *Circumcision*, and thereby admitted a member of the *Jewish Church*. The unbelieving Parent is said to be sanctified by the believing wife or husband, only to this purpose, to the making of the children holy, that is, capable of being members of *Gods visible Church*, as appeareth by the connexion and consequence of the words.

V. 17. Ἐι μὴ ἐχάσῃ ὡς ἐμίχρουν ὁ θεός,
 But

But as God hath distributed to every one, &c. To Translate, *εἰ μὴ*, but, in this place is somewhat harsh, and besides it marr's the sense. For remedy whereof the Greek Scholiast reads, *ἢ μὴ*, fitly joyning the words to the verse before, *ἢ τί οἶδας ἀνερ, εἰ τὴν γυναῖκα σώσεις, ἢ μὴ; ἐξέλτῳ*, &c. Or what knowest thou O man whether thou shalt save thy wife, or not? But there is no need to alter the reading at all, the common one with this distinction is enough, *ἢ τί οἶδας ἀνερ, εἰ γυναῖκα σώσεις, εἰ μὴ; ἐξέλτῳ*, &c. What knowest thou O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife, whether not? As God hath distributed to every one so let him walk.

V. 23. *Τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε, καὶ οὐ γίνεσθε δούλοι ἀνθρώπων*, Pretio empti estis nolite fieri servi hominum, *Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men.* This reading and Translation seems to respect our redemption by Christ, and literally implies a strange doctrine contrary to what he had taught immediately before, As if because they were redeemed by the blood of Christ, they should no more be servants, whereas before he bad them not to care if they were called being servants, but to remain in the same calling wherein they were called. So that I conceive there is some other sense more proper to the place, which possibly reading the first words with an interrogation may be this, *Τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε*.

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 187

ῥεῳαῖνται; μὴ γίνεσθε δούλοι ἀνθρώπων, Pretio
 redempti estis? Nolite fieri servi hominum,
*Are ye redeemed with a price? Become not the
 servants of men.* He speaks not here, of a
 redemption from the captivity of sin or the
 bondage of Satan, but from the service of
 man, as is to be gathered from the context
 which hath nothing relating or common to or
 with a spiritual redemption. The coherence be-
 ing plainly thus. *Art thou called being a servant,
 care not for it, Are ye redeemed with a price?*
 that is, are ye bought out and made free by a
 sum of money? *Why then, become not again
 the servants of men.* If thou mayst be made free,
 use it rather, otherwise, let every man abide
 in the calling wherein he was called [to be a
 Christian.] But for a more perfect under-
 standing of the place, These, ἀνθρώποι, men,
 whose servants he would have them no more
 become, are to be supposed ἄπιστοι, unbelievers;
 As before, v. 14. where the *unbelieving hus-
 band* is said to be *sanctified by the wife*, and
 the *unbelieving wife* to be *sanctified by the
 husband*, you are to understand γυναῖκα τῇ μι-
 σῇ, the wife that is a believer, and ἀνδρα μι-
 σῶν, the husband that is a believer, as it is in
 some Greek copies and in the Old Latin, so
 here in like manner is to be understood, Ἀν-
 θρώπων καὶ ἄπιστων, *Become not again the ser-
 vants of men who are unbelievers.* As before
 he advised in *impari conjugio*, so here he ad-
 viseth

viseth in impari servitio. As if he should say, *Art thou called to the Faith of Christ being a servant to an unbeliever? Care not for it, it is no matter, continue thou still so, and be content, That the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed, 1 Tim. c. 6. v. 1. Nevertheless if thou canst be made free and redeemed with a sum of mony, choose that rather, and become no more again a servant to any man that is an unbeliever. He doth not advise him for ever to decline all manner of service, from being a servant to all manner of persons. But in case he may have a believer to his Master, surely it was not the Apostles meaning to forbid such service. Who in the place aforementioned of Timothy, adviseth, that the servants who had πιστες δεσποταις, believing Masters, should by no means despise them because they were brethren, but to serve them so much the rather because they were believers. For service surely is not only necessary, but in some cases commendable.*

V. 26. Δια τὴν ἐνεσθῶσαν ἀνάγκην. These words some would have to refer to the Desolation spoken of by Luke 21. 23. But that ἀνάγκη μεγάλη, great distress, whereof our Saviour did there foretel, was to be Ἐν τῇ γῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, In this land and in this people, that is, in the land of Judea and among the people of the Jews where then our Saviour spake. So that it is not probable that

Paul

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 189

Paul should write to the *Corinthians* to abstain from Marriage for that distress or tribulation, which was so far distant from their borders, neither did personally concern them. Others I confess with more reason understand it of the Persecutions which were then at hand. But if you compare the context, there seems more reason to say, it was for the imminent pressure of the incommodities which for the most part accompany Wedlock, and are after mentioned by the *Apostle*, *Διὰ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ δυσκολίας, καὶ τὰ τῷ γάμῳ ὀχληρὰ*, For the difficulties and troubles of Marriage, Theophylact.

V. 29. *Τὸ τοῦτο δὲ φημι, [ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς σω-
σαλμῶσθαι τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστίν,] ἵνα καὶ ἔχοντες γυναῖ-
κας ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες ὥστε καὶ οἱ κλαίοντες, ὡς μὴ
κλαίοντες, καὶ οἱ χαίροντες, ὡς μὴ χαίροντες, &c.
ᾧ δὲ λέγει γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμα τῷ κόσμῳ τέτε, But I say
this, [because that which is remaining is but
a short time,] that both they that have wives
be as though they had none, and they that weep,
as those that do not weep, and they that re-
joyce, as those that rejoyce not, &c. For the
form of this world passeth away. After τὸ
λοιπὸν, is probably to be understood, τῷ βίῳ,
the remainder of their lives. As if he should
have said, Because the time of life is so short
upon earth, and the world passeth so suddenly a-
way, neither have we here an abiding City,
Heb. 13. 14. I tell you this, that ye be not*

too sollicitous, as he forthwith admonisheth them not to be, either for the miseries or pleasures of the world, as in some mens sense virginity and marriage, joy and weeping are accounted, but to be of an even temper in both estates.

V. 35. Τὐτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν συμφέρον λέγω, ἵνα βέρον ὑμῶν ἐπιβάλω, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὐαγγελίον καὶ εὐαροσέδρον τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἀπεισπάσως, Hoc vērō dico ad utilitatem vestram, non ut vinculum vobis imponam, sed ad id quod honestum est & decorum domino, sine violentā abstractione, *But this I say for your own profit, not that I should put an obligation or bond upon you, but for that which is comely and well besitting the Lord, without any forcible withdrawing or wresting of you.* Περισπᾶν, with Suidas is Μετὰ βίας ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τι, Vi aliquid abripere, *To wrest a thing away by force.* So as the sense is this, I tell you this for your own good, for that which is becoming you, and well besitting the Lord, not that I go about under the pretence of my Authority to impose a bond of necessity upon you to do the thing I commend unto you, Ὅσον ἵνα ἀναγκάσω ὑμᾶς καὶ δελόντας καὶ μὴ δελόντας παρασυνδένειν, *Not that I should compel you to continue in virginity whether ye will or no.* Τὼ δὲ ἀνάγκῃ βέρον καλεῖ, *For he calls necessity a bond, as the Greek Scholiast hath it, Ἀλλὰ ἀπεισπάσως, But without any compulsion, or forcible*

I. Ep. to the Corinthians, 191

forcible wresting of you to my opinion. For, for what I now say, I have no commandment from the Lord, &c. v. 25. Βεῖχθαι, δεσμεῖν, Hesyeh. ἐν ὑποσέδῳ, in the French tongue is, bien-seant, well besitting, quod bene assider, word for word. How the common Translations, either that of the vulgar Latin, Sed ad id quod honestum est, & quod facultatem præbeat sine impedimento dominum obsecrandi, or that of Beza, Sed ut decenter & aptè adhærescatis domino absque ullâ distractione, or that of the Interlineary, Sed ad decens & bene adhærens domino indistracte, or that of our English, But for that which is comely, and that you may attend upon the Lord without distraction, may or possibly can be reconciled in any lawfull construction to any of the senses imposed by them, I do by no means perceive or understand.

C. II. v. 7. Γυνὴ ὅ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστὶ, *But the woman is the glory of her husband. The meaning whereof is certainly extreamly difficult. Why not rather, the Image of her husband? A man indeed ought not to cover his head, Ἐκκεν ἡ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπαρχόν, Quoniam sit figura & Imago Dei, Because he is the figure and Image of God, but the woman is the Image of man. She is properly termed the Image of man, because she was taken out of him, as properly as Seth may be termed the Image of Adam who begot him in his likeness,*

ness, Gen. c. 5. v. 3. So מַמְנָה which with the Hebrew signifies the *Image, Figure* or *Similitude* which is drawn from another thing, the LXX Translate, δόξα, *Numb.* c. 12. v. 8. and *Psal.* 17. v. 15. and so *Phavorinus*, δόξα, εἰκασμός, *Effigies, Imago.*

V. 10. Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ὡς τὸς Ἀγγέλους. I was never yet satisfied with any Interpretation or Exposition upon this place, and therefore must crave leave to venture on a new one, resolving not to swerve from rules of Grammar, the use of words, or the scope of the place. Thus, Propter hoc debet mulier potestatem habere in capite per Angelos, *For this cause ought the woman to account the power to be in her head by the Angels.* So doth εἶναι often signify with the *Greeks*, and habere with the *Latins*, ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ, in capite, *in her head*, is, in viro, *in her husband*, as he is called, v. 3. And *Ephes.* c. 5. v. 23. ὡς is properly enough Translated per, *by*, as Διὰ Θεῶν ἐσώθην, *Per Deos servatus sum*, sive à Diis, *I was saved by the Gods*, Demost. Or be it Translated propter Angelos, *because of the Angels*, the sense will be the same. For the confirmation of this sense and Interpretation I shall borrow two arguments, the one from the words immediately preceding, the other from those which immediately follow. The force of the argument from the words preceding is this,
For

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 193

For the man is not of the woman but the woman of the man, neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. v. 8, 9. Ergo, Therefore ought the woman to acknowledge or account the power to be in her husband, who is her head. You have the same argument, 1 Tim. c. 2. v. 11, 12, 13. Let the woman be in silence in all subjection; for I suffer not a woman to teach; nor to usurp Authority over the man; but to be in silence. And why so? For Adam was first made; then Eve. So as for this very cause she ought to acknowledge the power in her husband, to whom she ought to be in subjection, and over whom she ought not to usurp Authority. When therefore the arguments are both the same, why should we question, but the Apostle intends the same direct sense in the one place; as in the other, when construction and the use of words do bear it? Why should we fly to violent notions and remedies when there is no need? The force of the other argument from the words that follow, v. 11, 12. is this, because they are a qualification or mitigation of the rigour of the injunction, least it might be taken by the husband in too strict and severe a sense. As if he should say, Although a woman ought to acknowledge the power in her husband by the Law of their creation which was delivered by the Angels, Gen. c. 3. v. 16. Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman,

nor

*nor the woman without the man by the Lord, for as the woman is of the man, even so also is the man by the woman, but all things are of God. From whence is necessarily intimated, that such is the mutual bond of relation between the man and the woman, that because one cannot be without the other, and because whatever they be, they are all of God, the man ought not to indulge, challenge or assume by any means too much to his own power, though given him by the Law of his creation by God himself, but to use it with modesty and sobriety, without the admission of which supplemental exposition, these latter verses for ought I know have no coherence with the former. And thus I suppose we rightly take these words as arguments of the womans subjection, nor deny we, but her subjection was an argument why she should be covered. But others who eagerly contend for a Forreign and unusual Interpretation of the word ἐξουσία, that they may expedite their business, pass by or rather reject this argument from the reason of the womans subjection, which is the most rational and certain, and frame another of their own, as we say per saltum, by a leap, or at least admit it. *The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man, &c. Therefore ought the woman to wear a hood or covering on her head, and therefore ἐξουσία in this place doth signifie velamen or signum**

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 195

signum potestatis viri, a covering or sign of the husbands power. To defend which opinion, some would have ἐξουσίαν, the power, by a Metonymy to be put for a covering, the sign of power. But this I take to be spoken of free cost, till I hear some more cogent Authorities. Others say, that the Apostle put ἐξουσίαν here, pro velo, for a covering or a veil, because the Hebrew word רריר, peplum, or velum, comes from the root, רר which signifies subjeēt, to subjeēt. But רריר, which signifies peplum, a veil, comes not from that root that signifies to subjeēt, but from ררר, which signifies extendit or expandit, to extend or spread, and therefore, רריר, is expansum aliquid, something spread, as is, velum or lamina, a veil or plate of metal, but hath nothing common with the former sense, but the sound, and therefore indeed hath no relation to ἐξουσίαν. It is frequent with the Hebrews who have no such abundance of words, for one and the same root as to the letters, to have divers significations, according to the pricks, and according to the divers significations to have divers yet proper derivatives, which I suppose are not promiscuously communicated one to another; or perhaps the same root or word written with the very same letters may be Hebrew, Syriack and Arabick. And so if we may believe Schindler, this very word רריר which signifies peplum a veil, is

an *Arabick* word, and not an *Hebrew* one, so that I cannot possibly think, that this notion ever came into the *Apostles* thoughts, but that he rather indeavoured to expresse what he meant in the most vulgar speech and common phrase. And truly this argument of theirs seems to me very preposterous, as if they meant to tie two extreams together without a *medium*. For who with reason can affirm, *Because a man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man, &c. Therefore ought a woman to wear a veil or a hood on her head*, by an argument fetcht from the moral Law of their creation? truly I have often heard that the whole Law of God was to be known by the discourse of reason, and was called *moral*, except the *Sabbath*, which some will not have therefore counted *moral*, because it is not to be known by the discourse of reason. But whoever could from the dictate of reason know, that a woman because she was made of man and for man, ought therefore to wear a veil or hood on her head *especially* in the Church? That she is therefore inferiour to her husband, and that therefore she ought to be subject unto him, is not abhorrent from the discourse of reason, and because she is for that cause subject to her husband, reason dictates she ought to acknowledge it, but by what means or sign she should do it in the Church or elsewhere, *custom* seems only to have

I. Ep. to the Corinthians, 197

have taught, especially in Christian Churches, as the *Apostle* intimates in this place. For we read not of any such *custom* in the *Old Testament*. *Rebecca* truly might [which they instance for an example] when she came near to *Isaac*, Gen. c. 24. v. 65. take a veil, and cover herself as well for modesty as for reverence. But *Judah* thought *Thamar* to be an Harlot, because she covered herself with a veil, Gen. c. 38. v. 14, 15. So that from the beginning the covering of a veil was no certain sign of subjection. And therefore I cannot but be still of the same opinion, that it is rightly interpreted according to the order of the arguments. *Because the woman is of the man, and the man not of the woman, &c.* For this cause ought a woman to acknowledge the power in her head, that is, her husband, according to the legitimate and known acception of the word, ἐξουσία. That is, ought to be subject to her husband, and because she is subject, ought in sign of her subjection to be covered in the Church, because it was comely and according to the institute of nature, v. 13, 14. As for the following words, ὡς τὸς ἀγγέλους, I conceive they are properly expounded, either by or because of the *Angels*, that is, by or because of the Law of their creation or the ordinance of God, who in the first creation did create them in that order by the *Ministry of Angels*, and at the same time by

the same Ministry of *Angels* did impose this Law of subjection upon the woman, of which the *Apostle* maketh mention 1 *Cor.* c. 14. v. 34. where the woman is commanded to be under obedience, καὶ ὡς ὁ κύριος λέγει, as the *Law* saith. Which Law all *Expositors* agree to be that in *Gen.* c. 3. v. 16. Καὶ ἂντος σε ὑπερδύσῃ, And he shall rule over thee. And this was most certainly given by the Ministry of *Angels*, as was that of *Moses.* *Act.* c. 7. v. 53. *Gal.* c. 3. v. 19. *Heb.* c. 2. v. 2. For all the external works of *God* are done and executed by the Ministry of *Angels*, whereof you may see more at large in Note on *Acts* c. 7. v. 35. In conclusion, this Interpretation doth flow so naturally from the words, and hath so little need of any *Forreign* help for its explication, that I have a very strong presumption, its the true and genuine.

V. 21. Ἐχρς & γδ τὸ ἴδιον δ᾿ ἔπνον ᾤε-
λαμβάνει, ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν καὶ ὡς μὲν πειρᾶ ἐς ᾧ
μεθύει. In most books, if not in all, the com-
ma is after φαγεῖν, and accordingly Translated. But that reading and version, Το ἴδιον
δ᾿ ἔπνον ᾤελαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν, *Propriam*
cenam *præsumit* in edendo, *In eating every*
one taketh before other his own supper, is surely not only harsh unto the ear, but in-
commodious also as to the sense. For remedy whereof I have thought it better to distin-
guish after ᾤελαμβάνει, and it being, as to
the

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 199

the trajection of the *copulative*, &, so frequent in the *New Testament*, I cannot but wonder at those that make any scruple of it, especially if it help us to an apter sense, and prevent an insolence of speech, as it doth in this very place, *Unusquisque enim præsumit cænam propriam, & in edendo hic quidem esurit, ille vero satur est, For every one taketh his own supper before hand, and in eating one is hungry, and another full.* So as the sense and coherence with the verse next going before and following after, and with v. 33, 34. is plainly this, *When therefore ye come together in one place, that is into the Church, it is not to eat the Lords supper [that which ye do] for every one taketh and eateth his own supper first, before others are come together, and so when ye eat, one is hungry and another full.* The rich are full, but the poor οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες (understand δέοντες) who have no supper of their own, are hungry. It seems there was a custom among the richer sort of the *Corinthians* to anticipate the *Lords supper* by eating every one their own which they brought with them privately, before the poorer sort were come together, But this he tells them was not to eat the *Lords supper*, and therefore he goeth on to reprove them, *What have ye not houses to eat and drink in, but you must surfeit and debauch μεθύειν here? or despise you the Church of God and shame τὸς μὴ ἔ-*

χοῦτας, *them that have no suppers? What shall I say unto you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not; And so at length after a digression to another discourse concerning the Lords supper, to v. 33. he returneth again to this, which he concludes with a short monition, Wherefore my brethren when ye come together to eat, that is, the Lords Supper, tarry ye one for another, and if any man hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together eis χρίμα, for your condemnation, that is, so as you may be blamed for so doing.*

C, 12. v. 11. Διαμερῶ ἰδία χάρις καὶ δὲ βούληται. The Arabick Interpreter seems to have read ἰδία. Distribuens unicuique quod ei proprium est, prout vult, *Dividing to every one what is proper to him as he will.* Rather, Dividens propria, i. e. sua unicuique, &c. *Distributing his own [gifts] to every one as he will,* which is more suitable to the sense, and to propriety of speech, ἰδία χαρίσματα, for its said, v. 4. Διαφέρει ὁ χαρισμάτων εἰς, τὸ ὃ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα. There are diversities of Gifts but the same spirit, And immediately before, Πάντα δὲ πάντα ἐργεῖ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα, *Hæc autem omnia operatur unus atque idem spiritus, But all these worketh that one and the self same spirit, dividing his own to every one as he will.* Ὡς δεσποτὸς καὶ θεός, *Ut dominus & Deus, Theophylact.* They are called μερισμοὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν,

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 201

ληπν, the Distributions, or as we Translate it, the *Gifts of the holy Ghost according to his will*, Heb. 2. 4. See *Joh.* 3. 8.

V. 29. Μὴ πάντες δυνάμεis; These words are better conjoyned and distinguished with those that follow, v. 30. μὴ πάντες δυνάμεis μὴ πάντες χαρίσματα ἰαργῶν ἔχουσιν; *Have all the power of working Miracles, have all the gifts of healing?* repeating the word ἔχουσιν, *have*, διὰ τὸ κοινὸν, as common to both. For surely it is not proper to say, *are all powers to work Miracles?* as necessarily we must, if we refer the words, to those that went before.

C. 13. v. 13. Νυνὶ ὃ μένει, πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα, μέζων ὃ τέτων ἡ ἀγάπη. Certainly these words are rendred best by a vulgar *Metathesis*. *And now abide these three, Faith, Hope and Charity, but the greatest of these is Charity.* Μέζων for μέγιστη, as μικρότερ@, for μικρότατ@, and νεώτερ@ for νεώτατ@, which happens very frequently, to wit, that Comparatives are taken instead of the Superlatives, as Πάντων σοφώτερ@ ὢ ὁ Σωκράτης, *Socrates was the wisest of all men*, and so you have, c. 15. 19. ἐλεεινότεροι for ἐλεεινότατοι,, *The most miserable of all men.*

C. 14. v. 2. Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλῶσση ἐκ ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ, ὑδεῖς γὰρ αἰκεῖ, πούμαρ ὃ λαλεῖ μυστήρια, Qui loquitur linguâ [exoticâ] non loquitur hominibus sed Deo, nemo enim intelligit, spiritu vero loquitur

tur mysteria, *For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men but to God, for no man understandeth him, but with his breath he speaketh mysteries.* That with his voice he speaketh hidden things which are not understood of them who are but *Ideots* and understand no other then their mother tongue. Πνεῦμα in this place, as *spiritus* likewise, is taken as נֶפֶשׁ is often taken in the *Hebrew*, for halitus, *breath*, the organ of the voice, Metonymically for the voice, φωνὴ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος, *the voice is from the lungs*, as *Hippocrates*, yet not immediately, but by the mediation of the breath which is caused by the lungs, and so *Hesychius*. Πνεύματι αἴτιον ὁ πνεύμων, *Spiritus causa est pulmo*. But the next cause of the voice is τὸ πνεῦμα, *spiritus, the breath*, and from thence it is that *Phavorinus* saith, Πνεῦμα ἐκφορὰ λέξεως, *Spiritus elatio dictionis, Breath is the bringing forth or the conveyance of the speech*, which differs not from the very voice, For without breath the principal organ of the voice its impossible to utter any sound. And that this is the *Apostles* meaning in this place, appears by the whole series of his discourse in this present Chapter. For it followeth, v. 13. Διόπερ οὐ λαλῶν γλῶσση, προσεύχεσθω ἵνα διερμυνῶν, Quapropter qui loquitur lingua peregrina precetur ita ut interpretetur, *Wherefore let him that speaketh [that is, that prayeth] in an unknown tongue,*

pray

I, Ep. to the Corinthians, 203

pray so as he may interpret, that is, that himself or some body else may interpret so that others may understand, as it is, v. 27. And of this use of the word *ἵνα* you may see *Budeus*, which also must be necessarily taken in the same sense, *Joh. c. 10. v. 17. Because I lay down my life, ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτὴν, so as I may take it up again.* He laid not his life down, to the end he might take it up again, but in such a manner so as he might take it up again, for as it immediately follows, *He had power to lay it down, and he had power to take it up again.* And thus it follows still in the same phrase and manner of speech, *Ἐάν γάρ ποτε σὺ λαλῶν γλῶσση, τὸ πλὴν μὲν ποτε σὺ λαλῶν, ὃ δὲ ἵνα μὲν ἀκατάληκτος ἔσται, Si enim precor lingua peregrina, spiritus meus precatur, mens vero mea est instructuosa, For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my breath [that is, my voice] prayeth, but my meaning is of no benefit to others, because they understand not what I say. What therefore is to be done? v. 15. Προσδύομαι τῷ νοῦ, προσδύομαι δὲ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ, Precabor spiritu, precabor etiam cum intellectu, I will pray with my breath or voice, and I will pray with understanding also, that is, so as I may be understood of others.* N^os with *Aristophanes* and in the *Glossary* is *sensus, meaning*, as *Νοῦν δὲ ἔχει πᾶς; Quis est horum verborum sensus? What is the meaning of these words?* And with this key its easie
to

to open the mysteries of this Chapter, which otherwise are hard to be understood.

V. 27. Ἐπε γλώσῃ τις λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο, ἢ τὸ πλεῖον τρεῖς, καὶ ἀνὰ μέρῳ, καὶ εἰς διερμηνεύτω, Sive quis loquatur lingua peregrina, duabus vel ad maximum tribus [scilicet linguis] fiat, idque singulatim, & unus interpretetur, quod si non sit Interpres, fileto, *Or if a man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be in two or three [tongues] at the most, and let one interpret, But if there be no Interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church.* It is very probable, that there might be divers in the Church, who could speak in many tongues, but ἐνταξίας ἐνεκα, for orders sake he permitted them to use but two or three tongues at most, and that by turns and not confusedly, nor without an Interpreter. But whereas most interpret those words κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς of the persons, seems to me by no means to agree with the sense or *Syntax*. For how one man should speak by another man according to the scope of this place is beyond my comprehension, ἔστω, fiat, is familiarly understood.

V. 30. Ἐὰν ᾧ ἄλλος ἀποκαλυφθῇ, &c. *But if any thing be revealed unto another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace, that is, before that other speak, to whom it is revealed, as much as to say, Let not him to whom any thing is revealed, offer to speak, till the other*

I. Ep. to the Corinthians. 205

other who was first speaking, hath made an end. For ye may all prophecy one after another, that all may learn and all be comforted, or exhorted, καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν ὑποτάσσεται, The meaning of which words is, either, the spirits of the Prophets are subordinate to the Prophets, that is, they are so mutually subordinate one to another, that they ought not to confound one another, or their hearers by unseasonable speaking two or more together, but to keep order in the Churches. For God, as it follows, is not the Author of confusion, but of peace in all the Churches of the Saints. Πάντα κατὰ τάξιν γινώδω, Let all things be done in order, Or thus, The spirits of the Prophets whereby any thing is revealed to them, are subject to those Prophets, to be guided by them, to be suppressed and uttered when they please, so that to prevent confusion in the Church, he to whom any thing is revealed, ought for a while to suppress his Spirit of revelation, till he who was first speaking hath made an end. Nor can I by any means think that out of these words there can be any argument raised for the trial of mens spirits or doctrines, a sense so generally imposed.

C. 15. v. 29. Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς νεκρῶν, εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, Alioquin quid facient qui Baptizantur pro mortuis

tuis si omnino mortui non resurgunt? Quid etiam Baptizantur pro mortuis, *Else what shall they do who are Baptized for dead if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then Baptized for dead?* Here is as it were a gemination of the question to make the matter of it the more observed. As if he should say What do men do or mean when they are Baptized? or why are men dipped under water as if dead *Συνταφέντες αὐτῶ ἐν τῷ βαπτίζματι, Buried with Christ in Baptism*, Rom. c. 6. v. 4. Col. c. 2. v. 12. if by rising out of the water, which is a type of the Resurrection after death, they be not ascertained, that *Christ* is risen from the dead, and that they also, if they rise from the death of sin to newness of life, shall likewise rise again with *Christ* after death to glory? In vain doth the Church use this sign of *Baptism*, if there be not a Resurrection. For *Baptism* is the lively type of the death and Resurrection of *Christ*, and consequently of all the faithful. And so hath it been received always by the *Ancients*, whereof you may see in note 1 *Pet.* c. 3. v. 23. And this doctrine *Zonaras* calls Τὸ ἡθ' ἡμῶν μυστήριον τοῦ θωάου, *Vim mysterii Religionis Christianæ, The very life and virtue of Christian Religion*, plainly affirming that they do, μετασπένειν, *loose their labour*, who are Baptized if they doubt of the Resurrection, in that that they demonstrate or set forth by their *Baptism*,

I. Ep. to the Corinthians, 207

tism, that is, by their immersion into the water, and their emersion out of the same, their death, and Resurrection, but doubt or not believe it in their hearts. And who so do, what they do, they do in vain. From whence you may conclude it was the opinion of those times, that the act of immersion in the water, in which the body is buried for dead, or as if it were dead, and the emersion again out of the same did lively represent the real death and Resurrection of the body, both in Infants, that could not confess the same, as also in grown persons, though they confessed not with their mouths what they acted in their bodies. The sign was still the same. Though it be likewise true, that those who were grown to the years of discretion when they were Baptized, as St Chrysostom tells us, did publickly confess, that they did believe in the Resurrection of the dead, and were Baptized in that Faith, adding farther in the same place, that for the better explaining of, βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, σὺν τῶν was to be understood, that they were Baptized for dead bodies, adding yet for farther confirmation, Thou art therefore Baptized because thou believest the Resurrection of the body, that is, that it remains not for ever dead. And thou by word of mouth confessest the Resurrection of the dead, and the Priest as it were in a certain figure or representative doth manifest unto thee by the things themselves, what thou dost believe
and

and hath confessed, &c. In like manner *Tertulian*, *Pro mortuis tingui est pro corporibus tingui, mortuum enim corpus ostendimus, To be dipt for dead is to be dipt for dead bodies, for thereby we shew our bodies to be dead.* Then which I think there can be nothing spoken plainer. And to this opinion agrees *Theodoret* also upon this place, Ὁ βαπτιζόμενος τῷ δεσποτὶ συνδαίπεται, *He who is Baptized is buried with the Lord, that when he hath been partaker with him of death, he may with him be also partaker of the Resurrection.* But if our body die and rise not again why is it then Baptized? And this I hold to be the proper exposition on this place and the scope of the *Apostles* meaning.

C. 16. v. 3. Ὅταν ὃ ᾤκησῃμι, ὡς εἰάν δοκιμάσῃτε, δι' ἐπιστολῶν τέτις πέμψω ἀπενελεῖν τιλὴ χρεῖν ὑμῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. *And when I shall be with you, whomsoever ye shall approve, I will send by letter to carry your liberality to Jerusalem.* In Translating of which words, I conceive under favour there are two mistakes in the *English Interpreter*, First in saying, *whom ye shall approve by your letters*, when Paul was come unto them, and secondly, in Translating to bring your liberality to Jerusalem, whereas Paul was not at Jerusalem, but at *Philippi*, when he wrote this Epistle to the *Corinthians*. Beside that, ἀπενελεῖν doth properly signifie, *auferre, to carry away.*

A N N O.

ANNOTATIONS

On the II. Ep. To

The Corinthians.

Ch. 1. v. 9.

A Λ' Αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ δόκημα
τῷ θανάτῳ ἐρήχμεν, Immo habui-
mus in nobis *or* in nos condemnatio-
nem mortis, *Yea we had the sen-
tence of death upon us.* As if he should say,
Yea we were so far in despair of life, as even
the sentence of death was past upon us, *that
we should not trust in our selves, but in him
who raiseth the dead, who delivered us from
so great a death, δόκημα, κατάκριμα, Hesych.
Phavor. and Suid.* And to this so great a
death its reasonable to suppose he was adjud-
ged by some sentence or conspiracy of the
Jews.

C. 2. v. 12. Ἐλθὼν ὃ εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα, εἰς
τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ δόξας μοι ἀνεωγμένης
ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅσα ἐποίησα, &c. Quum venissem au-
tem Troadem, & ostium mihi apertum esset
P per

per Dominum ad Evangelium Christi, non habui requiem spiritui meo, *But when I was come to Troas, and there was a door opened to me by the Lord to the Gospel of Christ, I had no rest to my spirit, not finding my brother Titus there, who if present would have eased me of a great part of my burden, which lay so heavily upon me being all alone, that I had no refreshment to my spirit, but taking leave of them I went into Macedonia.* There is nothing more familiar then the trajection.

C. 4. v. 4. Ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τῷ αἰῶνι τὰ ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι αὐτοῖς τὸ φῶς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ δόξης τοῦ χριστοῦ, &c. To make a fitting sense and a true construction, you must Translate, the Præposition ἐν, *among* (as commonly it is,) both in this and the preceding verse, and the words that follow by trajection. *If our Gospel be hid, it is hid, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, among those that are lost, among whom God hath blinded the minds of the unbelievers of this age, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, should shine unto them, that is, so shine, as that they should see and understand.* And that this is the proper rendring and meaning of the words, I am much induced to believe, because the Apostle seems to have a direct eye to that of *Isaiah 6. 10.* Where the Lord bids them go and *make the ears of this people heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes,*
and

II. Ep. to the Corinthians. 211

and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart and be converted. Besides *αἰών* is properly an age, *saeculum*, and not the world. The unbelievers of this age are meant, especially the *Jews*. As for the trajection, besides that divers of the Ancients did use the same in the exposition of these words, it is so familiar in the *New Testament*, that I cannot but wonder that any should scruple at it. And yet for better confirmation I shall alledge an Example or two, as *Joh. 11. 54.* ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Ἐφραῖμ λεγομένην πόλιν, for ἀπῆλθεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ἐφραῖμ, *He went unto a city called Ephraim.* *Act. 13. 1.* Ἦσαν ὃ πινες ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν ἔσταν ἐκκλησίαν ποροφῆται καὶ διδασκαλοι, for Ἦσαν δὲ πινες ποροφῆται καὶ διδασκαλοι κατὰ τὴν ἔσταν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, *Now there were certain Prophets and teachers in the Church that was in Antioch, and c. 25. 22.* Ὁ δὲ αὐριον, φησὶν, ἀκούσῃ αὐτοῦ, for Ὁ δὲ φησὶν, αὐριον ἀκούσῃ αὐτοῦ, *And he said, to morrow thou shalt hear him.* Whereas tis literally, *And he to morrow said thou shalt hear him.* And there were some in Antioch in the Church that was Prophets and teachers. And he went unto Ephraim which is called a City.

C. 5. v. 1. Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι, εἰ ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμεῶν οἰκία τῷ σκῆπτρῳ, Traiectio insignis, pro eam ἡ ἐπίγειος οἰκία τῷ σκῆπτρῳ ἡμεῶν, *If the earthly house of our Tabernacle were dissolved.*

C. 6. v. 13. Τῷ δὲ αὐτῷ ἀντιμοδίαν (ὡς τέκνοις λέγω) πλατυώθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς. Before τῷ you are to understand κατὰ, Then which nothing more familiar. Now according to the same compensation, (I speak to you as my children) be ye also enlarged. As if he should have said, O ye Corinthians our mouth is open to you, our heart is enlarged, Ye are not streightened in us, but ye are streightened in your own bowels [towards us,] ye have not the like affection for us as we have for you, As my heart therefore is enlarged toward you, so be ye also in like manner mutually enlarged in your bowels towards us.

C. 8. v. 1. Τῷ χάριν θεῷ. Moreover we do you to wit, or we would have you take notice of the great gift that hath been given by the Churches of Macedonia to the Saints. He stirreth up the Corinthians to the like liberal contribution by the example of the Macedonians. Χάρις, δωρεὰ, Hesych. εὐεργασία ἐκείσι, Phavor. Χάρις θεῷ, a goodly gift, as we Translate τὰς κέδρυς τοῦ θεοῦ, the goodly Cedars, Psal. 80. v. 10. and ὄρη θεοῦ, the high or great mountains, Psal. 36. v. 6. See note on, c. 10. v. 4. So Beza Translates χάριν, beneficentiam, v. 6. And so might he have done also, v. 7.

V. 18, 19. Συνοπέμψαμεν δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀδελφον (ὃς ἐπεμψεν ὅτι τὰ εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὃ μόνον δὲ ἄλλα καὶ χειροποιηθεὶς ἀπὸ τῶν

II. Ep. to the Corinthians, 213

τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνέκδημε (ἡμεῖς) σὺ τῇ χά-
 ρει ταύτῃ τῇ διακονεῖσθαι ὑφ' ἡμεῖς πρὸς τὴν
 αὐτῇ τῷ κρείν δοξαν καὶ προθυμίαν ὑμῶν, *And we*
have sent with him the brother (whose praise
is in the Gospel throughout all the Churches,
and not so only, but who was also appointed of
the Churches our fellow traveller) with this
charge which is administred by us for the glory
of him who is our Lord, and your encourage-
ment. In the first place I thought fit to
 make this large *Parenthesis* that the coherence
 might appear the better. For I-thought it
 more rational to say, that this Brother was
 sent with this charge of *Ministring* to the
 Saints, then to say he was appointed or chosen
 with it. In the next place tis manifest that τῇ
 χάρει in this place can signifie nothing but gra-
 tiam Ministerii in Sanctos, the *charge* or *office*
of Ministry to the Saints, committed to Ti-
 tus and this Brother, and to Paul himself. And
 so do Theophylact and the Greek Scholiast both
 interpret it. As concerning χειροτονθεῖς you
 may see note on Act. c. 14. v. 23. Lastly
 follows καὶ προθυμίαν ὑμῶν, which I have not
 doubted to render, *and for your encouragement,*
 for προθυμίαν ἐμβάλλειν, *alacritatem injicere,*
is to incourage. That is, that ye may be more
 cheerful in giving, more forward in your be-
 neficence, when you see they are honest and
 creditable persons, who are to collect and dis-
 pence your mony, so that no man can blame

us in this abundance which is administred by us, or conceive the least suspicion of us, as if we made any private use to our own gain of the monies committed to us. Persons of integrity and fidelity, and that not only one, but two or three, that the honour of God may be preserved and not blasphemed among the *Gentiles*. For we provide for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord but in the sight of men.

C. 9. v. 5. Ἐυλογίαν ὑμῶν, *Your bounty or liberal collection*, from λέγω, colligo, to collect. So εὐλογία in *Phavorinus* is Πληθυσμὸς ἀγαθῶν ἐξ ἐκκαιοῦ διδομένων, *An abundance of good things freely given*.

V. 8, 9, 10. Δυνατὸς ὃ ὁ θεὸς πᾶσαν χάριν περισσεύσαι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν παντί πάντιτε πᾶσαν ἀνταρρίαν ἔχοντες, περισσεύετε εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν (καθὼς γὰρ ἠπαί, ἐσκορπίζον, ἔδωκε τοῖς πτωχοῖς, ἢ δικαιοσύνη αὐτῷ μέχρι εἰς τὸ αἶμα· ὃ ὃ ἐπιχορηγῶν ἀπὸ τῶ ἀποθέοντι, καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρώσιν, χορηγῶσαι καὶ πληθύναι τὸ ἀποθεῖν ὑμῶν, καὶ αὐξήσαι τὰ γενήματα τῆ δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν) ἐν παντί πλετισόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπλοῖτητα (ἢ τις καταγράφεται δι' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἡ διακονία τῆ λειτουργίας ταύτης ἢ μόνον ἐπὶ ἀναπληρῶσαι τὰ ὑπερήματα τῶν ἀγίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσι διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ) διὰ τὴν δοκίμην τῆ διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν ἐν παντί, &c. Qui vero potens est Deus omnem gratiam faciat abundare in vobis, ut in omnibus sem-

II. Ep. to the Corinthians. 215

semper omnem sufficientiam habentes abundetis in omne opus bonum (sicut scriptum est, disperfit, dedit pauperibus, misericordia ejus manet. in æternum. Qui suppeditat semen seminanti & panem ad escam, suppeditet & multiplicet sementem vestram, & augeat fructus misericordiæ vestræ) in omni divites facti ad omnem liberalitatem, (quæ adoperatur per nos gratiarum actionem deo, quoniam ministerium oblationis hujus non solum est adsupplens inopias sanctorum, sed etiam redundans per multas gratiarum actiones deo) per probationem hujus ministerii glorificantes deum in vestra subjectione, &c. *But God who is able make all grace to abound toward you, that ye always having all sufficiency in all things may abound to every good work, (as it is written, he hath dispersed abroad, he hath given to the poor, his mercy endureth for ever. Let him that Ministreth seed to the sower and bread for his food, Minister and multiply your seed, and increase the fruits of your mercy) being enriched in every thing to all bountifulness (which worketh through us thanksgiving unto God, because the ministration of this service doth not only supply the want of the Saints, but doth also superabound by many thanksgivings unto God) by the experiment of this ministration gloryfying God in your blessed subjection to the Gospel of Christ, and your liberal distribution, &c. I see no need of Hebraism or Atticism to save*

the sense and construction in this place, for if the two *Parentheses* as they are here distinguished be duly observed, the sense and *Syntax* is so plain that he that runs may read and understand, the participles *πλεμπίζοντες* and *δοξάζοντες* being to be governed of the verb *ᾠδαιολύπη*, v. 8. I have chose to render the words in the form of a prayer, because it is usual with *S^t Paul*, as the *Fathers* have observed, to conclude his exhortations with a prayer. *Διχμοσύνη* I suppose is in this place properly Translated *mercy*, as also in the *Psalms* from whence the words are cited. So *Theophylact* interprets it on this place, *Ὁ ἐν ἐμῶν ἀγαπῶνται πᾶσι*, *Misericors ab omnibus diligitur*, *The merciful man is beloved of all*. And so the *LXX* do frequently render *דַּחַמְסוּיָהּ* *διχμοσύνη*, as you may see in note on *Matth. c. 1 19*. δὲ before *ἐπιχρηγῶν* is in this place redundant.

C. 10. v. 4. *Δωατα τῷ θεῷ*. *Exceedingly powerful*, just such another phrase, as *ἄσπετος τῷ θεῷ*, *exceeding fair*, *Act. c. 7. v. 20*. It is *Beza* his animadversion, and that it is to be expounded by an *Hebraism*, so *Νινευὴ ἦν πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ*, *מְגִלָּה עֲדֹמָה לַיהוָה*, *Magna deo, magna civitas*, *Now Nineveh was an exceeding great City*, *Jon. c. 3. v. 3*. So c. 11. v. 2. *Ζηλῶ ᾧ ὑμεῖς θεῷ ζήλω*, that is, as the *Greek Scholiast* saith, *ᾠδαιολύπη φιλῶ*, *ardenter amo vos, for I love with an exceeding zeal*. So *Psal. 80. v. 10*. you have *לֹא-יִי-אֵל*, *Tas*
κείδρως

II. Ep. to the Corinthians. 217

μέγας ὡς θεὸς, Cedros dei, *The goodly Cedars*,
 and Psal. 36. v. 6. בהררי-אל, ὡς ὄψθ' αὐτῶν,
 Sicut montes dei, *As the great mountains*. For
 the *Scripture* when it denotes any thing to
 be excellent, it adds one of the names of
 God. As Gen. c. 30. v. 8. Colluctationes dei
 colluctata sum cum sorore mea, נִפְתּוּרֵי אֱלֹהִים.
With great wrestlings have I wrestled. And
 1 Sam. c. 14. v. 16. Et factum est in trepi-
 dationem dei, לַחֲרַת אֱלֹהִים, *So it was a*
very great trembling. So Jud. c. 13. v. 6.
 The *Angel* of the *Lord* that appeared unto
 the wife of *Manoah* is by her termed יֵאֵשׁ
 אֱלֹהִים, ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, in the LXX. which
 I conceive by the context may be in the same
 manner best Translated, *A goodly man*, whose
 countenance was very terrible, cujus species e-
 rat augustior quam hominum communiter, *who*
had a more noble aspect than commonly men
have, as *Drusius*; or Qui mirum in modum e-
 rat facie veneranda, *That had a wonderful ve-*
nerable face, נֹרָא מֵאֵר, which word נֹרָא
 signifies *what ever excels in quantity or qua-*
lity. And so perhaps those words Pro. c. 20.
 v. 27. נֵר יְהוָה, &c. Φῶς αὐγῆς πνοῆς ἀνθρώ-
 πων, &c. may be better Translated *Spiritus*
hominis lumen valde excellens investigans omnia
penetralia ventris, *The spirit of a man is a*
most excellent light that searcheth the inward
parts of the belly, that is, the secrets of the
 heart. Whereas the common Translation [the
spirit

spirit of man is the candle of the Lord] is an odd expression, and somewhat difficult surely to make a good sense of.

C. 11. v. 4. Καλῶς ἠνείχεσθε. Seems to be spoken sarcasticè, or illusive, *bitingly or tauntingly*, the word καλῶς being to be understood here, as I conceive it ought to be Mar. c. 7. v. 9. Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε, *Ye fairly reject the commandment of God, that ye may observe your own tradition.* And so here, *For if a man come, and preach unto you another Jesus, whom we have not preached, &c. Ye would fairly suffer him, For ye suffer a man to bring you into bondage, &c.* v. 20. He reprehends their levity, and shews them how their minds were corrupted from the simplicity or sincerity which is in Christ, v. 3.

C. 12. v. 21. Μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντα με ταπεινώσῃ ὁ θεὸς με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, *Ne rursus quando venero Deus meus me vilem reddat apud vos, Least my God when I come again make me vile among you, or in your eyes, as before c. 10. v. 1. Ὃς κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν ταπεινός, Qui coram vilis, Who in presence am base among you.* As ταπεινός is *base or vile*, so ταπεινῶ is *vilem reddo, to make base or vile.* As if he should say, I am afraid that as I was base and contemptible in your eyes when I was with you before, so also when I come again God will suffer me to be reputed vile in your eyes, and so I shall be forced to bewail many of

II. Ep. to the Corinthians. 219

of you *who have sinned* and not yet repented. He was afraid they would flight him, and therefore take no care to repent.

C. 13. v. 5. Ἐαυτὲς πειράζετε, εἰ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἑαυτὲς δοκιμάζετε (ἢ ὅτι ἐπιγινώσκετε ἑαυτὲς ὅτι Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν) εἰ μὴ πᾶς δοκιμῇ ἐστὶ, *Examine your selves whether ye be in the Faith, prove your own selves (or do ye not know your own selves, that Jesus Christ is in you or among you?) whether ye be not void of this proof [which ye seek in me.]* This verse and the next following verses do perfectly answer to the *Apostles* words in the beginning of v. 3. The sense following necessarily, Thus, Ἐπεὶ δοκιμῇ ζητεῖτε τὸ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλῶντα ἥτις (ὅς εἰς ὑμᾶς ἔκ ἀδυνατεῖ, &c.) ἑαυτὲς πειράζετε εἰ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἑαυτὲς δοκιμάζετε, εἰ μὴ πᾶς δοκιμῇ ἐστὶ ἐλπίσω ὅτι ὅτι γινώσκει ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἔκ ἐσμέν ἀδοκιμῇ, &c. *Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me (who toward you is not weak, &c.) examine your selves whether ye be in the Faith, prove your own selves whether ye be not without the proof [of Christ in you,] But I hope ye shall know that we are not without the proof of Christ speaking in us.* Ἀδοκιμῇ is compounded of, α, privative, and Δοκιμή, ἀντὶ τὴ δοκιμῆς, *Without proof.* The *Apostle* playes upon the word through the whole discourse. The scope whereof to make more clear, I shall in a short *Paraphrase* run through the whole discourse

course of the *Apostle* upon this subject. He had heard that there were some among them who did not esteem him according to the dignity of his *Apostleship*, but held him for a man *that walked after the flesh*, c. 10. v. 2. and did not stick to say among themselves that *though his letters were weighty and powerful, yet his bodily presence was but weak, and his speech contemptible*, and from hence assumed unto themselves a liberty of sinning more freely, not believing that he would come at all, and *therefore puffed up*, 1 Cor. c. 4. v. 18. or if he did come, that he would not come *with a rod and terrour*, yea that were not afraid to call his very *Apostleship* into question, who required *σπουδῇ*, a proof of Christ speaking in him. To meet therefore with the boldness of these men, and yet not be compelled to use (which by all means he avoided) his power, with severity, which God had given him for edification, and not for destruction, he being absent writes thus unto them, *This third time come I unto you*, [in this Epistle] *because every word may be established by the mouth of two or three witnesses*, that ye may be sure without all doubt that I will come, and that with a rod, *for as I told you before when I was present with you*, and as I being absent likewise told you in my former Epistle, so do I now write again unto you, and to those that have sinned, and to
all

II. Ep. to the Corinthians. 221

all others, that when I come again I will not spare. But, as I hear, ye do not believe that God hath committed this power unto me, but ye account me as some contemptible person, and therefore, *δοκιμῶν ζητεῖτε*, ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, whom ye shall find when I come not weak, but powerful enough, for though he was crucified because of his weakness by being man, he liveth yet by the power of his Godhead; and though we also be infirm and weak, as he was, ye yet shall feel, that we also live by the same power of his Godhead, when we come unto you. But since you require *δοκιμῶν* a proof of Christ speaking in me, I pray first prove your own selves, whether ye be not your selves without this proof, *ἑαυτοὺς δοκιμαζέτε εἰ μὴ πᾶσδοκιμοὶ ἐστέ*, (or is it possible when I have preached and written to you so many times that ye should not know yourselves, that Jesus Christ is in or among you?) but I hope ye shall know however, that we are not *ᾠδοκιμοὶ*, without the proof of Christ in us. But I am loath to use it, and therefore pray that ye may do no evil, *ἐν* understand *εὐχόμεν*, [*ὡς τὸ τῆς ἡγούμης*] I do not pray that we may appear with this proof of Christ speaking in us with power, but that ye may do that which is good, and that we our selves may be *ὡς ᾠδοκιμοὶ*, as without this proof, not having need to use our power with severity,

city, which God hath given for edification and not for destruction, &c. And thus I suppose I have sufficiently explained the proper meaning of ἀδύναμις and δύναμις in this place. In the explication whereof under favour in my weak opinion *Interpreters* have very much laboured besides the meaning of the *Apostle*.

ANNO.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Ep.

To the Galatians.

Ch. 2. v. 2, 3, 4. &c.

A Νέβλω ὃ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ ἀνε-
 δέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω
 ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, κατ' ἰδίαν ὃ τοῖς δο-
 κῶσι, (μὴ πως εἰς κενὸν πρῆξι ἢ ἐ-
 δραμον, ἀλλ' ὅτι Τίτῳ ὁ σὺ ἐμὲ Ἑλλην ὡν
 ἠναγκάσθη περιτεμεθῆναι. Ὡς ὃ τὸς παρεισάκτες
 ψευδαδελφους οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν
 ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἐχαίρομεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα
 ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσωσιν. Οἱς ὅτι πρὸς ὧραν εἰ-
 ξάμενοι τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου
 διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Ἀπὸ ὃ τῶν δογματῶν ἐστὶ
 τί, ὁποῖοι ποτε ἦν ὑδὲν μοι διαφέρει. *Inter-*
preters generally would have this place under-
stood, as if Ὡς τὸς παρεισάκτες, &c. because
of the false brethren who were brought in un-
awares and came in privily, &c. Titus were
not compelled to be circumcised, and as if these
false brethren were they, οἱς ὑδὲ πρὸς ὧ-
 ραν,

224 Annotations on the

εαν, &c. to whom he writes he would not give place no not for an hour. Neither of which do I conceive to be the meaning of the Apostle. But rather, that he communicated his Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles privately to those of reputation, that is, to those *οἱ δογματες συλγοι* ⁽²¹⁾ who were reputed pillars, because of the false brethren, *οἱ τιτες παρεισῆλθον*, who used to creep in privily, (for so may *παρεισῆλθον* being a tense indefinite be lawfully interpreted) that they might spy out the liberty they took upon them in Christ Jesus, And that for maintenance of the truth of his Gospel which he had preached among the Gentiles that the Mosaical Law was abrogated, least he might seem to preach or to have preached and laboured in vain, and for no other cause was Titus not compelled to be circumcised. And therefore doth Estius rightly conclude in the voice of Paul. Quod si Apostoli, &c. If the Apostles to whom I communicated my Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles had thought the Mosaical Law, whereof Circumcision is a principal part had been necessary for the Christians, they would certainly have caused Titus whom I brought with me to be circumcised, *atqui id factum non est, but that was not done, &c.* Whereby he clearly intimates his opinion, that the reason why Titus was not compelled to be circumcised was, that the truth of Pauls Gospel might

re-

Ep. to the Galatians. 225

remain. And as this reason suites best with the coherence of the Text, so doth it likewise best agree, That the *Apostle* did communicate his Gospel to those who were reputed pillars in the Church *ἡς τ' ἰδίων*, *privately apart* from the rest, of purpose, because the false brethren who used to creep in privily into their assemblies, might not be present to spy their debates and actions, and consequently it is to be presumed they were not present, for whose sake the meeting was purposely appointed private. And then how can it properly be with reason said, that *Titus* was not compelled to be circumcised for their sakes, who were not at all present, their company being purposely declined. And if this be so, then must we without farther dispute conclude, that *εἰς*, *the persons to whom*, v. 5. the *Apostle* thought not fit to give place no not for an hour, must be *those of reputation*, the *τοῖς δοκῶσι*, v. 2. that is, to the chief *Apostles*, *Peter*, *James* and *John*. Between whom and *Paul*, we may gather from the discourse of the place, there was no small contention, probably about the circumcision of *Titus*, *Paul* producing that to the *Galatians* in the first place, as it were by way of triumph, to let them know he had the better of it. *I communicated my Gospel to them which I preach among the Gentiles*. But, they were so far from having any thing to find fault with in

Q

my

my preaching, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔχειν μέμψαδι τὸ Παύλου κήρυγμα, as *Theophylact* hath it, that neither was *Titus* who was with me being a *Gentile* compelled to be circumcised. And surely there was some heat between *Paul* and them, concerning the observation of *Moses* Law, and its possible they might be too much κέρω δουδόντες, *servants to the time*, they might possibly connive at some things, least the faithful among the *Jews*, (who being *Zelots of the Law*. *Act.* c. 21. v. 20. thought they were bound to hold it fast) might chance to be offended, and so fly back from the *Christian* Faith. For which their prudence *Paul*, as the *Greek Scholiast* hath observed in his praise, hath not stuck to call them, δογμαῖς, καὶ καταγνωσμένους, καὶ κατακρινόμενους μὴ ὀρθοδοξοῦντας, *persons of reputation*, or of great esteem, *worthy of reprehension*, and *dissemblers who walked not aright*, so that he may establish the Gospel of *Christ*. Now to these chief *Apostles* who were reputed *Pillars*, it was, that *Paul* thought not fit to yield, as he after saith, that he resisted *Peter* to the face, v. 11. Neither ought we to think so meanly of our *Apostle*, as if he would on any terms have yielded to the false brethren, though possibly he might have done it to the chief *Apostles*, whom he knew to be at least ἰσοτίμους, *of equal honour*, and *Ministers* of the same Spirit and Gospel with him. In sum,

Transf-

Ep. to the Galatians. 227

Transpose but (for your present understanding) those words, κατ' ἰδίαν ᾧ τοῖς δοκῶσι, after the word, μετ' ἐπιμνησιν, and I conceive the sense runs most perfectly clear. *And I went up by revelation, and communicated to them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, least by any means I should run, or had run in vain, Yea neither was Titus who was with me being a Gentile compelled to be circumcised, but privately to them of reputation, and that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus that they might bring us into bondage. To whom we gave place by subjection no not for an hour, that the truth of the [or my] Gospel might continue with you. To whom, relating, to them of reputation, and not, to the proximum antecedens, which is not at all times necessary. If any demand what means κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν, by, or according to revelation. For my part I think there's no necessity to run to any vision by day or night, but that κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν doth here signifie some Revelation or Manifestation which had been made unto him either by fame or word or Letter, that there was a rumour at Jerusalem that he taught a doctrine differing from the Apostles, of which James gave him notice in expresse words, Act. c. 21. v. 21. Κατηχηθήσων σε, &c. They have heard of thee, that thou teachest all the*

Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses; saying that they ought not to Circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs of their Fathers. For which rumours sake perhaps it is said, *Act. c. 20. v. 22.* Behold I am δεδεμμένος. τῷ πνεύματι, obstrictus animo, resolved in my mind to go to Jerusalem, what ever becometh of me to testify (as follows) the grace of God, but whether that journey and this were σύγχρονα at one and the same time I cannot determine, but tis certain he went for one and the same cause to testify and vindicate his Gospel which he had preached among the Gentiles. In the last place come to be considered the words that follow; Ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ἐναι π ὅποιοι πτε ἦσαν ἕδεν μρι διαφέρει. In the explication of which words there is no need of any figure or other supplement then is common in the Testament. Understanding οἱ before ἀπὸ, the like whereto you have *Joh. c. 16. v. 17.* Εἶπαρ ὅω ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, for οἱ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, *Dixerunt discipuli*, as the vulgar Latin, *Then said some of the disciples*, And *Act. c. 21. v. 16.* Συνῆλθον τῷ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν, for οἱ τῶν μαθητῶν, *Then came with us some of the disciples*. The same construction Beza and Grotius both allow, *Matth. c. 27. v. 9.* Ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, for οἱ ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, *Filii Israel*. The phrase it self is frequent, as *Οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Πλάτωνων*, *The Platonicks*, *Οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν*

Ep. to the Galatians. 229

πλήθους, *The Plebeians*, 'Οι ἐν πίσει, *Those that are of the Faith*, Gal. c. 3. v. 7. And τῶν δὲ τοῦ τῆ αἰρέσεως τοῦ φαρμακίου, *Certain of the sect of the Pharisees, &c.* So as you may very lawfully Translate, Qui vero videbantur esse aliquid, qualescunque tandem illi fuerint, nihil meâ interest, *But what ever they were, who seemed to be something, it is no matter to me, God accepteth no mans person.* Or it may be Translated thus with regularity and sense enough, distinguishing only after ἔδεν. Nihil vero ab iis, qui videbantur esse aliquid, qualescunque illi fuerint, meâ interest, *But nothing from those who seemed to be something, what ever they were, concerneth me at all.* That is, nothing that they either said or did concerns me, for as it follow, 'Οι δε-
 κρυῖτες ἔδεν ἐμοὶ ὡς οὐκ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, *They that seemed to be something added nothing to me.*

V. 19. Ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ τὸν νόμον νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, *For I through the Law am dead to the Law*, that is, by the knowledge of the Law do know that by the Law there is no life, and therefore to the Law acknowledge my self dead, *that I may live unto God.*

C. 3. v. 20. Ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν. *The best Expofitor of these words without comparifon is the Æthiopick Interpreter. Deus tamen unus est duorum, But God is one of the two. Wherefore then is the Law that was ordained by the Angels by the hand of a Mediatour ?*

But a Mediatour is not a Mediatour of one party alone, it being necessary that there be two parties between whom there is a Mediatour. Now one of these two parties (between whom there was a Mediatour to convey the Law) is God. Neither can there be any other intelligible sense rendred of the words. What is the unity or simplicity of the essence of God to the scope of the place, or the Apostles purpose? But if he say that God is *is one of the two* between whom Moses was a Mediatour, the sense is obvious, do not the promises of that very God which he gave to Abraham, fight with the Law, he gave *by the hand of Moses*? God forbid, &c. How Moses was this Mediatour between God and the children of Israel you may find punctually recorded, *Levit. c. 26. v. 46. Ταυτα ο νομος, &c.* Hæc sunt lex quam dedit Dominus inter se & filios Israel in monte Sina per manum Moſis, *These are the Law which the Lord gave between him and the children of Israel in mount Sina & by the hand of Moses*, the very phrase used in this place.

ANNO.

 ANNOTATIONS

On the Ep.

 To the Ephesians.

Ch. 1. v. 7, 8.

K A T' A τὸ πλεον τὸ χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, Secundum divitias gratiæ ipsius quam abundare fecit in nobis, *According to the riches of his grace which he hath made to abound in us in all wisdom and prudence.* Ἐπερίσσευσεν is to be understood here in the *Hebrews Hiphil*, as ἐξέλιψεν is 2 Cor. c. 9. v. 8. Χάριτος ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν, is a common phrase with the *Greeks*, who according to the *Atticks* do put the *Relative* in the same case with the *Antecedent*, as, Χεῶμαι οἷς ἔχω βιβλίοις, and κατὰ πάντα ἔκρινεν θεῷ, *Coram Deo cui credidit, Before God whom he believed*, Rom. c. 4. v. 17.

C. 2. v. 1. Καὶ ὑμεῖς ὄντας νεκροὺς. Of what word, ὑμεῖς, *you*, should be governed, I conceive, there hath been a long mistake by rea-

Q 4

son

son of the incommodious distinction of the Chapters. Most *Interpreters* after ὑμεῖς, *vos, you*, add of their own the *verb*, vivificavit, *hath he quickned* to supply the sense. One affirms that this Accusative, ὑμεῖς, *you*, is governed of συνεζωποῖναι, *hath he quickned*, v. 5. by a chain of figures. For he saith, *there is in this place an Hyperbaton, and a Synchysis, an Apocope, or cutting short of the Period, which is a kind of an Anantopodoton, the cause of which anomaly or irregularity, is the interjection of some long sentence.* But to what end serves all this pomp of figures? What need is there of them in a matter which if duly observed, is not at all obscure? For look but back to the Nineteenth verse of the foregoing Chapter, and you shall find, sense, coherence and construction extreamly plain and safe without supplement or figure. Καὶ τὸ τοῦ υπερβαλλόντος μεγάλου τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς πιστεύοντας () καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς παραπτώμασι, &c. *And what is the exceeding greatness of his power toward us who believe () and toward you who were dead in trespasses and sins.* The intervenient words, Κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κρατοῦς, &c. *According to the working of his mighty power, &c.* to the end of that Chapter being all properly included in a *Parenthesis*. To this I cannot imagin any thing to be objected but the length of the *Parenthesis*, it being of it self not only plain but extreamly fit and proper,

not

Ep. to the Ephesians. 233

not to say, necessary. But I beseech you is not the *Parenthesis* altogether as long, if ὑμεῖς, you, be governed of συνεζωποῖναι, hath he quickned, v. 5. and the construction much more harsh? see also, *Rom. c. i. v. i. &c.* unto the 7, and c. 2. where, v. 13, 14, 15, are all included in one *Parenthesis*, not much shorter then this. Besides many other places in which you may find *Parentheses* well near as long, but much more perplex and intricate. Nay no less then a whole Chapter hath been allowed to a *Parenthesis* by no mean *Judgement*. In the mean while you may observe, what obscurity this importune division of the Chapters causeth to the Text. And where it bringeth not obscurity, it is yet an unhandsom fraction dividing matter that is coherent. As you may see in *Colos. c. 4. v. i.* which in all reason should have been joyned to the foregoing Chapter. *Coherent cum superioribus neque scindenda fuere*, Grot.

C. 3. v. 10. ἵνα γνωρεῖτῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὅτι τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, That now may be known to principalities and powers the manifold wisdom of God in heavenly things throughout the Church. Things that pertain to the leading of an eternal life in heaven, *Joh. c. 3. v. 12, Eph. c. i. v. 3.* They are called ἐπουράνια καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐπιτελεῖται, heavenly things though done on earth, as Chrysostom

fofom observes in 'another place. Whereas some interpret the *Principalities* and *Powers* to be the *Angels*, methinks is far from the scope of the place. For to what intent or advantage were it, if perhaps by the preaching of the Gospel many mysteries of *Christianity* might be made known unto the *Angels*, which to them were hid before? *This grace v. 8. was given to Paul to make known these things.* But Paul had no Commission to preach unto the *Angels*, neither did he but to the *Princes of the Gentiles*. Others object that the Gospel was not known to the *Princes of the Gentiles*, or to earthly Powers till the days of *Constantine*, and that therefore the *νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις*, now *Principalities and Powers* must be meant the *Angels*. But if it were not known, surely it might have been. I beseech you who were *Herod, Felix, Festus and Agrippa*, the *Magistrates at Philippi, Thessalonica and Athens*? were they not all *ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι*, *Principalities and Powers*? of whom speaketh Paul when he admonisheth *Titus* to be subject *ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις*, to *Principalities and Powers*? were not these earthly *Magistrates*? Could not then the Gospel be known to all? Nay was it not preached to all, and was it not known to all though some rejected it?

C. 4. v. 26. Ὁργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε,
Be angry and sin not. There is no doubt
but

Ep. to the Ephesians. 235

but the *Apostle* borrowed these words of the *Psalmist*, from the *Greek Interpreters*, *Psal. 4. v. 4.* though *Beza* and our *English Interpreter* have made no reference thereto in the margin. The reason whereof I suppose is, because they did otherwise interpret the *Hebrew*, as have many others, reading, *Contremiscite & nolite peccare, Stand in awe and sin not.* But I rather assent to *Musculus* who retains the *vulgar reading* in the *Psalms*, *Irascimini & nolite peccare, Be ye angry and sin not, ductus Autoritate Pauli, being thereunto led by the Authority of S^t Paul.* Besides that the *Hebrew* יִרְאָה, signifies not only to *stand in awe* but also to *be angry*, a mans passion is as well moved for anger as for fear, for even anger makes a man to tremble. Neither have we *Pauls* Authority alone for the reading but his exposition of the sense. For the words following of *S^t Paul* are meer *Paraphrase* on the words following in the *Psalmist*, both agreeing in one and the same sense, *Ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδύετω, Let not the Sun go down upon your wrath, neither give place to the Devil, saith the Apostle, Λέγετε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἐπὶ ταῖς κλίσταις ὑμῶν, κατανύγητε, Dicite in cordibus vestris super cubilia vestra, quieto esto te animo, Commune with your hearts upon your beds, and be still, saith the Psalmist.* As if the meaning of both were this, If perhaps it happen that ye are angry, neither is any passion quicker,
take

take heed ye sin not by being angry longer then is fit, let not your anger abide till the going down of the Sun, neither make ye that Devil a nightly guest, suffering him to lodge with you, but chase him away, let him vanish before ye go to bed, that on your beds ye may be still and quiet, in a posture to commune with your selves, *to say your prayers in your hearts*, as the *Chaldee* hath it, plainly shewing how comfortable, how necessary a thing it is for our thoughts to be free for our pious meditation, when we are newly laid in our beds, to which nothing is a greater enemy then to have any exacerbation rest upon our spirits. The *vulgar* and *Greek* Translation render *κατανύμμι* *compungimini* in this place. For the *Hebrew* is *רמו*, which *Pagnin* and others Translate, *Et tacete, And hold your peace*, but *רמ*, signifies *to be quiet*, as well as *to hold ones peace*, and so reads *Aquila*, *ἡσυχάσατε*, *quieti estote, and be still*, as we render it. So with *He-sychius*, *κατανύμμι, ἡσυχάσατε, κατάνυξις, ἡσυχία*.

C. 6. v. 20. Ὑπερ ἢ ᾧ προσδύω ἐν αλύσι, Pro quo legatione fungor in vinculis, *For which I am an Ambassadour in bonds*. But why may it not be more properly translated, Pro quo senesco in vinculis, *For which I wax old in bonds*. So *Paul* styles himself *Philem. v. 9.* Παῦλ. ὁ πρεσβύτης ὁ δέσμιος, *Paulus senex & vincetus, Paul the aged and a prisoner of Jesus Christ*. According to the most proper signification of the word.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Ep. To

The Philippians.

Ch. 2. v. 16.

Λ'ΟΓΟΝ ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες, Verbum vi-
tæ firmiter tenentes, *Holding fast the*
word of life, that I may rejoyce in the
day of Christ, that I have not run in vain,
nor laboured in vain. Ἐπέχοντες, κρατουῶτες,
Hesych. φυλάσσοντες, *Phavor.* See 1 Cor. c. 3.
v. 14, 15. *Joh.* Ep. 2. v. 8.

C. 3. v. 5. Περιτομὴ ὀκταήμερος. I never
yet met with Interpreter, that made a Gramma-
tical construction of these words, when tis
not easier to set an egg on the end, then to
construe them according to rule, without force
or figure, only understanding, what is fre-
quent in every Page, the verb *ἴω*. Περιτομὴ
ἴω ὀκταήμερος, ἐκ γένους *ἴω* Ἰσραήλ, &c. Cir-
cumcisio erat octiduana, *My circumcision was*
the eight day, ut pateat, as Chrysostom saith,
Non fuisse Profelytum, That it may appear
he

he was no Profelyte, Ex gente fui Israelis, I was of the stock of Israel, Ut pateat neque à parentibus quidem natum Profelytis, That it may appear that he was neither born of Profelyte parents, &c. So that if any had cause to have confidence in the flesh, Paul had.

V. 15, 16. Ὅσοι ὄντι πληροὶ, τὸ τοῦ φρονῶ-
μεν, καὶ εἰ τι ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε, καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑ-
μῶν ἀποκαλύψει (πλὴν εἰς ὃ ἐφ' ἡμῶν) τῷ
αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν κανόνι, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, Quot
quot ergo perfecti sumus, hoc sentiamus, &
si quid aliter sentitis, & hoc quoque revela-
bit vel revelet vobis Deus (præter ad quod
pervafimus) eâdem incedere regulâ, idem
sentire, As many therefore as be perfect, let
us be thus minded, and if in any thing ye
be otherwise minded, God will reveal, or God
reveal this also to you (besides what ye have
already attained unto) to walk by the same
rule, to mind the same thing. The Future
Indicative for the Imperative is a frequent He-
braism. But whereas Interpreters do gene-
rally Translate στοιχεῖν and φρονεῖν in the Im-
perative in the first person plural, Eâdem in-
cedamus regulâ, idem sentiamus, Let us walk
by the same rule, let us mind the same thing,
alledging it to be an Atticism, truly when I
cannot find such another Atticism in all the
New Testament, and when I see no necessity
at all for pretending such a figure in this place
nor advantage to the mending of the sense
thereby,

Ep. to the Ephesians. 239

thereby, I thought it better to Translate them in the *Infinitive* according to the usual manner of speech, it being as I conceive, not only more *Grammatical*, but more agreeable also to the *Apostles* purpose. For as I have heretofore more then once observed out of the *Fathers*, that *it is the Apostles custom, to conclude his exhortations with a wish or prayer*, so when he had exhorted them here to be so minded as he himself was, he presently prays or wishes that *God* would reveal this also to them, besides the knowledge they had already attained to, to walk all by the same rule that he himself walked, and to be of the same mind that he was, that they might be followers of him, and *observe those who took him for their example, whose conversation was already in heaven, &c.*

ANNO.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Ep.

To the Colossians.

Ch. i. v. 23.

TOΤ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει τῇ ἐπὶ τὸ ἔρανον, *Which was preached in or through the whole creation under heaven.*

C. 2. v. 14. Ἐξαλείψας τὸ κατ' ἡμῶν χειρογραφον, τοῖς δόγμασι ὅτι ἡμεῖς ὑπεραντίον ἡμῶν, *Expungens quod adversum nos erat chirographum, in traditionibus nobis contrarium, Wiping out the hand writing that was against us, which was contrary to us in Traditions.*

V. 18. Μὴ εἰς ὑμᾶς καταβεβηέντω δέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, καὶ μὴ εἰδέντων ἐμβατεύων, *Let no man deceive you with subtile arguments who pleaseth himself in humility and the worshiping of Angels, curiously prying into or ventring on those things which he hath not seen. That is, venturing to determine or judge of things whereof he hath no know-*

Ep. to the Colossians. 241

knowledge, Καταβαβόλω, καταλογίζεω, Phav. θέλω, εὐδοκῶ, Mar. c. 12. v. 38. Psal. 147. v. 10. Ἐμβατεύου, τὰ ἐνδον ἐξεργήσας ἢ σκοπήσας, Phavor. But properly ἐμβατεύω is ingredior or pedem pono, to put or set ones foot.

V. 23. Ἀτινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ὃν ἐδελοθησικία, καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ ἀφειδίαν σώματος, ἐκ ὃν πμῇ πνι πρὸς πλησμυνὺν τῷ σαρκός. After σώματος, understand ὄντος, which is so frequent as I have often observed. Which things truly have a shew of wisdom, in superstition and humility, and afflicting of the body which is in no esteem for the pampering of the flesh.

C. 3. v. 7. Ἐν αὐτοῖς, When ye lived among them, that is, the children of disobedience.

V. 8. Νυνὶ ὃ ἀποδεδε, &c. It is not so fitly Translated in the English in the Present tense, in the Indicative mood: its better as it is in the Old Latin Deponite, in the Imperative, But now also put ye off all these, &c. μὴ ψεύδεσθε, ly not one to another, as it follows in the next verse.

C. 4. v. 5. Τὸν καθεὶν ἐξαγορεύοντες, In sapientia ambulate erga eos qui foris sunt lucrantes tempus, Walk in wisdom toward them that are without gaining time. As if he should say, Offend not the Gentiles by any unseasonable deportment, but as far as in religion

R

you

you may in all things submit unto them, gaining as much time as you can to do good in. To that end let your speech, as it follows, be seasoned with salt. Undertake not unseasonable contentions, but give to every one the reverence which to him is due, so as you injure not your own souls. Hear Paul himself speaking to Agrippa: I think myself happy because I shall answer for my self before thee this day. And truly you may generally observe Paul not doing any thing rashly whereby he might loose the opportunity to draw any to the Faith. You meet the same phrase in Daniel c. 2. v. 8. *Ὅτι χρόνον ὑμῖν ἐξαργυρίζειν*, Certe novi quod tempus lucramini, that is, diem diffunditis ut consumatur tempus & vobis detur efugendi occasio, as Junius, I know of a certain that ye would gain time, ye spin it out, that ye may get an opportunity to escape.

V. 16. *Καὶ τὸ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ*. There is no need with Grotius to vary the reading by leaving out *ἐν* contrary to the testimony of all copies, when as it is *apud* dictum rightly said as it is in the Old Latin, Et eam quæ est Laodicensium vos legatis, And read ye that of Laodicea, not that which was written from Laodicea to them, but which was written from the Apostle to the Laodiceans, which why or how it is lost as is that other to the Corinthians, and another to the Ephesians, as also other books of Scripture, is known to God alone.

I. Ep. to the Theſſalonians. 243

lone. For the phrase is frequent, ας, *τινες*
τῶν ἐκ τῆ συναγωγῆς, *some of the Synagogue*,
οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, *the Faithful*, οἱ ἐκ τῆ σόας, *the*
Stoicks, ἀνεμοὶ ἐκ νυκτῶν χαλεποὶ, *the night*
winds are grievous.

ANNOTATIONS

On the I. Ep. To the

Theſſalonians.

Ch. 2. v. 16.

EΦΘΑΣΕ ὃ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος,
But the wrath of God is come upon
them in the end. They have killed
Jesus and their own Prophets, and
they have persecuted us, neither care they for
God, but are contrary to all, forbidding us to
preach unto you that ye might be saved, but the
vengeance of God is come upon them in the
end. Their measure was full, and the De-
struction of Jerusalem was at hand.

R 2

ANNO-

A N N O T A T I O N S

On the II. Ep. to The
Thessalonians.

Ch. 2. v. 3.

M'ΗΤΙΣ ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ κατὰ μη-
δένᾳ τρόπον ὅτι, εἰ μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀπ-
εργασία πρῶτον. It is in all copies di-
stinguish't after τρόπον, which doth
so confound the *Grammatical* construction, that
no true interpretation can be given of the
words, which is easily reconciled by this di-
stinction after ὅτι, plainly thus, *That ye be
not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither
by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from
us, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέσκηεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ χριστοῦ, as that
the day of Christ is at hand, μήτις ὑμᾶς ἐξα-
πατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένᾳ τρόπον ὅτι, understand
ἐνέσκηεν by a common repetition. Let no man
deceive you by any means, that it is at hand,
εἰ μὴ, unless there come a falling away first,
and that man of sin be revealed, the son of
perdition. Tis true Interpreters make a shift to
make*

II. *Ep. to the Thessalonians.* 245

make out the sense, but they take no thought of the *Syntax*. For what can be the meaning of, ὅτι εἰ μὴ, I must confess is beyond my Fathom.

V. 7. Τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῇ ἀνομίας· μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται. After κατέχων understand ἐστὶ, μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἐστὶ. Jam enim mysterium operatur iniquitatis; tantum est qui ad præsens obstat, vel impedit, donec è medio fiat, *For the mystery of iniquity worketh already, only there is one who hindreth, [that is, the working of it,] till he be taken out of the way.* Tantum est qui nunc obstat, *Only there is one who hindreth.* Quis nisi Romanus status? *Who but the Roman state?* Tertullian. Non absurdè de Romano imperio creditur dictum, *Tis not unfitly thought to be spoken of the Roman Empire,* August. Hunc locum exponunt de Imperio Romano, quo soluto fit venturus Antichristus, *Eras.* and many others.

A N N O T A T I O N S

On the I. Ep.

T o T i m o t h y .

Ch. I. v. 3.

K ΑΘ' ΩΣ *περσεν* λέσσι σε, *περσμεναι* εν 'Εφέσω πορεύομαι. *eis* Μακεδονίαν, ἵνα *ἀπαγγείλῃς*, &c. *Περσμεναι* being accented with a *Circumflex* in the middle syllable, the *Imperative* *Σίνε* or *μέμνησο* is to be understood, for by a familiar *Elleipsis* the *Infinitive* is frequently put for the *Imperative*, as you may see, *Act. c. i. v. 4.* and elsewhere. But if it be accented with an *Acute* in the third from the end, *περσμεναι*, as perhaps it ought, for the accents are not the Authors, then is it the *Imperative Aorist* of the middle voice, which is frequently used in the *Old Testament*, so that either of these two ways the *Anantapodosis* is taken away, neither is any supplement necessary of our own, such as is that *vide ut denunties*, or so do, in the *English*. The Syn-

tax

I. Ep. to Timothy 247

tax being plain, As I besought, or advised thee, abide thou a while at Ephesus as thou goest into Macedonia, that thou mayst charge some that they teach no other doctrine, &c.

C. 2. v. 6, 7. Ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καθεὶς ἰδίῳ· εἰς ὃ ἐπέδωκεν ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, διδασκαλῶν ἔθνων. It is a wonder to consider, how the unhappy pointing of the words, and the unseasonable division of the verses hath made *Interpreters* destroy the sense and meaning of this place, and yet make no good construction neither, whenas pointed and distinguisht as they ought, the sense is excellently good and the construction plain and easie, thus, Ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον, καθεὶς ἰδίῳ· εἰς ὃ ἐπέδωκεν ἐγὼ κήρυξ, &c. The sense running intirely thus, Εἰς γὰρ θεός, v. 5. &c. Unus enim est Deus, unus etiam mediator Dei & hominum, homo Christus Jesus, qui dedit semetipsum redemptionis precium pro omnibus, ipsum testimonium, cujus ego proprio tempore constitutus sum prædicator & Apostolus, &c. For there is one God, and one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, the very Gospel, unto which in due time I was ordained a Preacher and an Apostle, &c. Τὸ μαρτύριον is doubtless here *Appositive*, taken as they call it, *παρανοήτως*, or *materialiter*. As if he should say, the summ or whole matter of the Gospel,

R 4

[for

248 Annotations on the

[for so μαρτύριον is often used by our *Apostle*, as 1 *Cor.* c. 1. v. 6. c. 2. v. 1. 2 *Tim.* c. 1. v. 8, 10, 11. and elsewhere] whereof I am ordained a *Preacher*, consisteth in the knowledge of one *God*, and one *Mediatour Jesus Christ*, who gave himself a ransom for all. Κατα τοῖς ἰδιοῖς is applied in the very same sense, *Tit.* c. 1. v. 3. As for the trajection of the words there is nothing more familiar.

V. 10. Ἀλλ' ὁ πρέπει γινῆσθαι ἐπαγγελίας μὲν δεικνύειν δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν. The *Parenthesis* is best pretermitted as in *Stephanus*, before ὁ is γινῆσθαι to be understood. Sed quemadmodum decet mulieres quæ pietatem spondent per bona opera, *But as it becometh women who promise or profess piety by their good works.* It is neither proper sense or Greek to say, κοσμεῖν ἑαυτὰς δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, which should have been rather written with the *Preposition* ἐν and the *Dative case*, as in the foregoing words, with which according to that interpretation it ought to agree, Κοσμεῖν ἑαυτὰς μὴ ἐν πλέγμασι, &c., Ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς. The whole context running thus, *I will therefore that men pray, &c. In like manner that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety, not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls or costly array, but as it becometh women professing Godliness by their good works.*

V. 15. Σωθίσεται ὁ Χρὶς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Interpre-*

I. Ep. to Timothy. 249

interpreters for the most part render it, *Salvabitur vero per liberorum generationem*, *But she shall be saved by the Generation of children*, our own Translation saith, *by child bearing*. But what thereby they mean I comprehend not, unless they understand the Generation of the Son, the seed of the woman that shall bruise the serpents head, by which both Adam and Eve and all their off-spring shall be saved, if they continue in Faith and Charity. He begins in the *Singular* number, and concludes in the *Plural*, the like changes of number being very frequent. You may see in particular, 1 Cor. c. 5. v. 12.

C. 4. v. 1, 2. Διδασκαλίαις δαίμονιων ἐν ὑποκρισὶ ψευδελογίαν, &c. Attendentes spiritibus erroris & doctrinis dæmoniorum in hypochrysi loquentium mendacium, &c. *Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils speaking lies in hypocrisie, having their conscience seared with a hot iron*. But the Syntax of the words cannot bear these Translations. For τινες θεοσέχνης is in *casu recto* as Mr Mede hath excellently observed, but ψευδελογίαν, κακωπειρασμῶν, καλύοντων. &c. in the *Genitive*, so that they cannot be governed one of another and so construed without breach of Grammar unsampled in Pauls Epistles as that Author saith. Though learned Beza faintly salves it by conniving at it as a *Solacism*, with a, Major est habita sententiæ quam constructio-

structionis ratio, *The Apostle had more regard to the sense then to the construction*, whenas in truth there is no sense without the true construction. For if you shall say they must refer to δαμνίωνων, dæmoniorum, devils, what a strange sense is that to say that devils should speak lies in hypocrisie, and have their conscience seared? And therefore to salve these irregularities and absurdities, he undeniably concludes, that the Genitives ψευδολόγων, κακουργιασµῶν, κωλυόντων are all governed by ἐν ὑποκρισὶς, and that ἐν here doth signifie causam or modum actionis, the cause or manner of the action, so that the proper and genuine Translation must be thus, Attendentes Spiritibus erroris & doctrinis dæmoniorum, per hypochrysim falsiloquorum, &c. Giving heed to seducing Spirits and doctrines of devils through or by the hypocrisie of such as tell lies, that have their conscience seared with a hot iron, and forbid to marry, &c. The Æthiopick reads, Doctrinæ Satanicæ, Devilish doctrines, as we Translate Οὐνόμου & ἀδινίας, Injustus Oeconomus, The unjust Steward and the like, or it may be in the sense of Μὲδε, doctrines concerning demons, as Διδασκί βαπτισµῶν, The doctrine of baptismes, that is, concerning baptismes, Heb. c. 6. v. 2. and Πίσις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, The Faith of the Son of God, that is, concerning the Son of God, Gal. c. 2. v. 20. Or if you will, Concerning Idols, For so δαµνίονα

I. Ep. to Timothy. 251

μῦσα is put for Idola, *Idols*, Psal. 96. v. 5. in the LXX. And so perhaps it might be well interpreted, 1 Cor. c. 10. v. 20. and elsewhere. The meaning being this, that through the hypocrisie of lying teachers, that have seared consciences, &c. *Many shall depart from the Faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and devilish doctrines, or doctrines concerning demons or Idols, such as are worshipping of Saints, &c.* Castalio had probably the same observation concerning the inconvenience of the construction, as the words are commonly Translated, and therefore renders them in the same manner as M^r Mede, *Per simulationem hominum falsiloquorum, Through the hypocrisie of men that speak lies, and have their conscience seared.* His note upon this place being this, *Hominum, addidi, ne falsiloquorum & sequentia referrentur ad dæmonia, I have added, men, lest speaking lies and that which follows, might be referred to devils.*

V. 3. Κωλύοντων ἡμεῖς, ἀπεχεσθαι βεβήκων, &c. I marvel that our late Interpreters take no heed at all to what the Greek Scholiast hath observed on these words. To wit, that there is in them no σφάλμα καλλιγραφικόν, *fault in the copy* as some would have it, nor παρόραμα ἀποστολικόν, *slip or oversight of the Apostle*, as others, but that they were spoken ὀρθῶς, *properly* according to a genuine Atticism, such as is, Ἐκώλυεν μὴ κλέπτειν, Pro-

Prohibuit furari, *He forbad to steal*, Εκάλεν ἀπέχεσθαι ἀρρητοποιίας, *Vetuit actum nefandum*, *He forbad the doing of what was unfit to speak*, καλούντων in this place being to be repeated Ἀπὸ τῆς κρινῆς, καλούντων γαμῆν, καλούντων ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων, *Forbidding marriage, forbidding meats*, For to words which are in themselves negative Atticks add a negation, as Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ψεύτης εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀνρέμνυς, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐστιν ὁ χριστός; *Quis est mendax nisi qui negat Jesum esse Christum? Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? 1 Joh. c. 2. v. 12.* Whereas the literal interpretation is, *Who is a liar but he who denieth*, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐστιν ὁ χριστός, *that Jesus is not the Christ?* So that we may with modesty say, that though the word [commanding] as it is supplied, doth express the meaning of the place sufficiently, yet is it not according to rules of Grammar.

C. 5. v. 4. Εἰ δὲ τις χήρα τέκνα ἢ ἐκγόνα ἔχει, μανθανέτω πρῶτον τὸ ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν, καὶ ἀμφιβαῖς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς παροῦσι, *But if any widow hath children or nephews, let them first learn to be pious to their own house, and to requite their parents.* Τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν is all one with, parentes revereri, to reverence their parents, for as Stephanus tells us τὸ εὐσεβεῖν doth sometime signifie pietatis officio fungi erga parentes, *to perform the duties of piety to ones parents.* For there

is

I. Ep. to Timothy. 153

is a piety towards *parents*, as well as toward *God*. And in that sense, tis said in *Virgil*, Sum pius *Aeneas*, he was called *pious Aeneas*, for his piety to his Father *Anchises*, in that he carried him away being aged on his back at the firing and destruction of *Troy*. And so you have in *Cicero* 3. *Offic.* Ipsi patriæ conducit pios habere cives in parentes, *It is behoveful for the common wealth to have citizens pious to their parents.* And in *Quintil.* Præstanda pietas parentibus, *Piety is to be perform'd to parents.*

V. 13. Ἀμα ὃ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσιν περιερχόμεναι, &c. The Old Latin Traslates it right, Simul autem & otiosæ discunt circumire domos, *And withall being idle they learn to wander about from house to house.* Though *Beza* is pleased to blame this version, saying it was an harsh *Enallage*, forgetting himself I suppose that with the *Greeks* the participle is frequently put for the Infinitive with words that signifie any affection of the mind, as Μένωμεν ἰδόν, *Memini vidisse, I remember that I saw it.* And I hope it cannot be denied but τὸ μανθάνειν, *to learn*, doth signifie an affection of the mind as well as τὸ μνησθαι, *to remember.*

V. 23. Μὴκέτι ὑδρωπότι. &c. *Drink no longer water, &c.* This verse seems to have crept into this place besides the meaning of the *Apostle*, by some accident. Perhaps it was added

ded in the margent, and by the inadvertency of the Transcriber inserted in its wrong place. For the 22. and 24. v. cohere punctually together. *Χεῖρας ταχέως, &c.* Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other mens sin, keep thy self clear, that is, be not guilty of their sin, for some mens sins are manifest before hand, preceding to Judgment, that is which go before the laying on of hands, of which he may possibly judge who layeth on his hands, wherefore he cannot be excused from the guilt of those sins if he layeth on his hands: and some they follow after, that is, their sins are not manifest till after Judgment or laying on of hands, and of these there can be no certain Judgment, and therefore he shall not be guilty or partaker of them, who layeth on his hands, and this is the sense of *Chrysostom*. So as the 23. v. seems to have been inserted by some mistake, ἀγνός, καθαρός, ἄγνος, Phavor, Purus, inscius, Pure, or ignorant of.

C. 6. v. 2. Ὅτι τὸ εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβάνοντοί, They who are to partake of their well doing, or honest labour. The sense running thus, They that have believing Masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but let them rather serve them, because they who are to partake, or have the benefit, of their work, are believers and beloved. Or εὐεργεσίας may be taken in the common acception of

I. Ep. to Timothy. 255

of the word, that is, beneficii, *who are to partake of the benefit*, to wit, of their service.

V. 5. Νομισμάτων ποροῦν ἢ τῷ ἐνδοξείαν, Existimantium pietatem esse quæstum or mercaturam, as the Arabick Translater renders it. *Supposing that Godliness is a trade to get by, or a way or means to get a living.* He speaks of those that profess Religion that they may thereby grow rich or get a living. *Yet Godliness with contentment is mercatura magna ποροῦς μέγας, a great or sure way to get by.* Whereas they who make hast to be rich, by the pretence of Religion, fall into temptations and a snare, for the love of money is the root of all evils, v. 10. ποροῦς, ipsa actio comparandi & acquirendi. Modus victus quærendi seu quæstus faciendi, Steph. Φοι̃ γὰρ δύοι̃ μόνοις καὶ ῥῆδι̃ ποροῦσι, γεωργία καὶ φειδοῖ, Dicunt enim duobus tantum uti modis faciendi quæstum, agriculturâ & parsimoniâ, Plut. *They used but two ways of getting, tillage and patrimony or thrift.* So quæstus is a craft or trade to get by, Vall. Cicer. Plaut. &c.

ANNO.

ANNOTATIONS

On the II. Ep.

To Timothy.

Ch. 2. v. 25.

MἮποτε δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετανοήσῃ, &c. Cum modestia eos corripientem qui resistunt, forte dabit eis pænitentiam, *In meekness instructing or rebuking those who oppose themselves, perhaps God may give them repentance.* So Theophylact, ἴσως, φησὶν, ἔσται τις διορθώσις, *Fortasse, inquit, erit aliqua emendatio, Perhaps, he saith, there may be some amendment, fortasse dederit Dominus pænitentiam, perhaps the Lord may give them repentance.* So the Greek Interpreters Translate μὴ ποτε, where the Chaldee, Samaritan and English render forte, perhaps, Gen. c. 24. v. 5. and 29. c. 43. v. 12. c. 50. v. 15. And Gen. c. 32. v. 20. They Translate the same word, ἴσως, which elsewhere they render μὴ ποτε.

C. 3. v. 6. Ἐνδύοντες εἰς τὰς οὐρίας, Qui se se

seſe immergunt in familias, *Emphatically* with us, *Who dive into Families*, more properly than, *Who creep into Families*.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Ep.

To Titus.

Ch. I. v. 2, 3.

ΕΠ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίᾳ ἣν ἐπηγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς Θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰονίων ἐφάνεωσεν ᾧ κατ' ἰδίους ἔ λόγον αὐτῷ ἐν κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπισέυθην ἐγὼ, *In hope of eternal life which God who cannot lie promised before the world began, but hath made manifest in due time by or according to his word in or by preaching, wherewith I have been instructed, &c.* Before ἔ λόγον, understand, κατὰ, so in *Aristophanes* you have γνώμῃ ἐμῇ, for κατὰ γνώμῃ ἐμῇ, *According to my meaning*. Whereof there are numerous examples in the *New Testament*. See likewise, 2 *Tim.* c. I. v. 9, 10, 11. where is the same sense and expression in effect, Only instead of ἔ λόγον, there is διὰ τῆς εὐαγγελίας.

A N N O T A T I O N S

On the Ep. To

The Hebrews.

Ch. I. v. 3.

Ο Σ ὧν ἀπαύγασμα τὸ δόξης, &c. Certainly ἀπαύγασμα in this place is somewhat more then single αὐγασμα, as it is commonly Translated, Splendor ejus gloriæ, *The brightness of his glory.* For ἀπαύγασμα is as it were Ἀυγασμα ἀπὸ τοῦ δόξης, *A brightness shining from the glory of God, relucencia or refulgentia, quod ex alio resplendet,* as *Erasmus* and *Vatablus*; so with *Phavorinus* ἀπαύγασμα is ἐκλαμψις, *Fulgor vel splendor emicans, A brightness springing or darting from another body, radius gloriæ dei,* as the *Syriack Interpreter* hath it. *A beam of the glory of God, the very character of his person, φῶς ἐν φωτὶ, light of light,* as the *Greek Scholiast* observes upon the place. Ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου, καὶ ἑσπέρου ἀκηλίδωτον τὸ τῷ θεῷ ἐνεργίας, καὶ εἰκὼν τὸ ἀγαδότητος αὐτοῦ, *Refulgentia*

Ep. to the Hebrews. 259

gentia æternæ lucis, speculum sine macula virtutis dei, & Imago bonitatis ejus, *The refulgence of the eternal light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the Image of his goodness, as wisdom is stiled, Wisd. of Sol. c. 7. v. 26. or as it is there immediately before, Ἀπὸρροια τῆ παντακράτορος δόξης, Emanatio gloriæ omnipotentis, A pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty, as we read it in the English.*

V. 4. Τοσούτω κρείττων γένόμενος τῶ ἀγγέλων, *Tanto superior factus Angelis, Being made so much superiour then the Angels. Το ἐλαττον ὑπὸ τῷ κρείττον ἐυλογεῖται, Minus seu inferius à superiore benedicitur, The lesser or the inferiour is blessed of the superiour, c. 7. v. 7. So we read in Philemon*

Ἀγαθὴς γυναικὸς ἐστὶ ὧ Νικωστράτη
Μὴ κρείττον' εἶναι τὸν ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ὑπήκουον.

Bonam uxorem decet non superiorem esse viro, sed obedientem, *A good wife must not be superiour but obedient to her husband.*

V. 7. Ὁ ποιῶν τὰς ἀγγέλους αὐτῷ πνέματα καὶ τὰς λειτουργίας αὐτῷ, πυρὸς φλόγα, *Who makes his Angels, his spirits and his ministers, a flame of fire.* The scope of these words is to shew how much *Christ* was superiour to the *Angels*, in setting forth the inferiority of their office, in that they were but the Spirits and Messengers of God. Whereas *Christ*

his Throne was from everlasting for ever and ever, God was to him a Father, and he to God a Son. But as concerning the *Angels* he saith, Qui facit Angelos suos, Spiritus & Ministros suos, flammam ignis, *Who makes his Angels, his Spirits and his Messengers, a flame of fire.* That the words should be thus Translated, I gather from this, In that the *Apostle* calls them, v. 14. λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, *Ministring Spirits* joyn'tly, whom he here calls πνεύματα καὶ λειτουργοὶ αὐτοῦ, *his Spirits and his Ministers* dividedly. Πυρὸς φλόγα, *a flame of fire*, I conceive to be *Appositive* to the foregoing words. As if he should say, That he made his *Angels* his Ministers sometimes in the shape of a flame of fire, as *Exod. c. 3. v. 2* Ὁφθαλμὸς αὐτοῦ ἀνέβλεπεν ἐν φλογὶ πυρός, *And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire.* It being frequent in the *Scripture* for the *Angels* to put on divers shapes and forms according to the nature of the imployment which God commands them.

C. 2. v. 5. Ὁ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν μετὰ ἡμῶν λαλῶμεν, *For unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the [or rather this] world to come, whereof we now speak, τὴν for ταύτῃ.* The world to come whereof he now speaketh cannot be meant to be other, then the age of the world where- in the dispensation of Salvation v. 3. began
by

Ep. to the Hebrews. 261

by Christ and his Apostles, which was not now subject or committed to the Ministration of Angels, as was the Law in former time, which was ordained by Angels, Act. c. 7. v. 53. Gal. 3. v. 19. For before Faith came, Ὑπὸ τῷ νόμῳ ἐφρερέμεθα κατεκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίσιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, *We were kept under the Law shut up unto the Faith which was to come* [in this world whereof he now speaks] *to be revealed.* But now the administration thereof is subject to the Kingdom of Christ by the preaching of the Gospel, in the latter times with signs and wonders, καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, and divers powers, which he calleth, c. 6. v. 5 Δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the powers of the world or age to come,* which as I said before, can be no other then, Sæculum salutis, and mundus Evangelii, *The age of Salvation, and the world of the Gospel.*

C. 5. v. 7. Ἐξαυδῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐυλαβείας, *Et exauditus est à metu suo, i. e. servatus à metu suo, Anà was saved from his fear.* So heard that he was freed from the same. So Psal. 55. v. 16. Where the Hebrew is יְיָ שָׁמַע, The Greek Interpreters have, Ἐίσίκυσε, ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸ θεὸν ἐπέκραξα καὶ ὁ κύριος εἰσίκυσέ μου, *I will call upon God and the Lord shall save me.* And so the Arabick, and Æthiopic both Translate it, *Et dominus exaudivit me.* As also, 2 Chron. c. 18. v. 31. The word שָׁמַע, which signifies in Hebrew opitulus

latus est, *he hath holpen me*, the LXX Translate εἰσῆλθεν, as it is in *Wechelus* his edition. And *Jehosaphat cried unto the Lord, and the Lord helped him*, Καὶ κύριος εἰσῆλθεν αὐτῷ, *The Lord heard him so that he saved him*. So the *Roman* edition reads, Καὶ κύριος ἔσωσεν αὐτὸν, *And the Lord saved him*. The phrase is not unlike in our own Translation, *Psal. 22. v. 21. For thou hast heard me from the horns of the Unicorn, that is, thou hast or wilt save me from the horns of the Unicorn.*

C. 6. v. 1, 2. &c. Διὸ ἀφέντες τὰ τὰ ἀρχαῖα τῆ χειρὸς λόγον, ἐπὶ τῷ πλεονησίᾳ φερωμένοι μὴ πάλιν δευτέρῳ καταβαλλόμενοι μετανόιας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, καὶ πίστεως, &c. Quapropter linquentes prima elementa Christi provehamur ad perfectionem, non rursus jacentes fundamentum resipiscentiæ ab operibus mortuis & fidei in Deum, &c. *Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us be carried on to perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of Faith in God, of the doctrine of baptism, and laying on of hands, and of the Resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment. And this will we do, or let us do if God permit, for it is impossible to renew again unto Repentance those who have been once inlightned, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and been partakers of the holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and shall*

Ep. to the Hebrews. 263

shall fall away, crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh, as much as in them lyes, and putting him to open shame. He reprehends them in the former Chapter, v. 12, 13. For that when for the time they ought to have been teachers, they had need that one should teach them again which were the first principles of the Oracles of God, that they were become babes again and had need of milk. In these words therefore he exhorts them, that they should not return again to learn the fundamentals of Religion, such as were the doctrines of Repentance, of Faith in God, and of baptism, &c. But that they should strive forward to perfection, perfection which consisted in perseverance. For this he saith he urgeth to no other end, v. 11, 12. but that they should show their diligence ad pleniorē spei certiorationem, to the fuller assurance of their hope unto the end, and that they be not slothful, but followers of them who through Faith and patience inherit the promises, he would not have them Apostatize from the Faith, and fall away crucifying again the Son of God, &c. For then how hard it will be to restore such again, the following words sufficiently declare, Ἀδύνατον γάρ, &c. For it is impossible to renew them again unto Repentance, &c. In which place impossible is put for extremely difficult, as Christ saith in the Gospel, It is impossible, ἀδύνατον, for a rich man to enter into the king-

dom of heaven, that is, *παρ' ἀνθρώποις* in the opinion of men, or *with men* it may seem impossible. And from this impossibility or difficulty of restoring such a one, it is worth the observing, that *Apostates* were always the most implacable and deadly enemies of the *Christian Religion*. But he adds a reason of this impossibility, *Nam terra quæ generat herbam, &c. For the earth which brings forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed receiveth blessing from God, but that which beareth thorns and briars is ἀδόκιμος, inutilis, unprofitable*, without any shew of its tructification, and therefore, *ἀποβλητός* and *ἄχρηστός*, as *Hesychius*, κατὰρας ἐγὼ, as the Fig tree, *Luk. c. 13. v. 9. nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned*. But from this similitude one may gather, that it is not plainly impossible to renew such persons to repentance, but it notes a labour or difficulty in doing of it, for if the husbandman shall with care and diligence thoroughly weed these thorns and briars out of his ground, it is not to be despaired but that this ἀδόκιμος unprofitable ground, may yet in due time bring forth herbs meet for the use of man. It denotes a difficulty scarce to be conquered, yet conquerable, it is not ἀδόκιμος or ἀποβλητός, extremo sensu, *to be rejected in the utmost sense*, it is only vicina ad interitum, *nigh unto destruction*, if the grace of God intervene, it is of power to deliver

Ep. to the Hebrews. 265

deliver it from the fire. it can extirpate the sinful corruptions of the flesh, it can change the hardness and barrenness of the heart, and make it fruitful to good works, it can give place for Repentance, and give the thing itself. And that this is the proper meaning of this place, the scope of the *Epistle* argues, which principally intends or makes it its whole business to stablish the *Hebrews* firm and persevering in the Faith, and to keep them from *Apostacy*, to which they were too prone, not only because of persecution, but also for that they had been so long accustomed to the *Ceremonies* of the *Mosaical Law*, which they saw *God* suffered still to remain in his holy Temple, that they could not totally without reluctance free themselves from observance of them, and rely on *Christ* alone. And for this cause he so often exhorts them in this *Epistle*, that *they hold the beginning of their confidence steadfast unto the end*, c. 3. v. 14. *that they hold fast their profession*, c. 4. v. 14. *that they hold fast the profession of their Faith without wavering*, c. 10. v. 23. And this exhortation he strengthens with arguments from the excellency of the promise, and the credit of the promiser. Whatever he enlargeth in this *Epistle* of the Law, of its *types* and *ceremonies*, of their invalidity and abrogation, of the excellency of *Christ*, and Faith in him, so frequently and so sublimely, tends
all

all unto this one end, that he may fix their Faith stedfastly in *Christ*, that *they might run with perseverance the race which was set before them*, c. 12. v. 1. *that they might not be wearied and faint in their minds*, v. 3. &c. Here is one thing more observable, and that is, an eminent trajection in the words, as we have before Translated them, neither can they be regularly Translated any other way. Ἀδιωκτον γὰρ πάλιν ἀνακαταίξεν εἰς μετάνοιαν τὸς ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας, &c. ἀκαταίξεντας, ἀνακαταίξεντας, &c. For it is impossible to renew them again to repentance who have been once enlightened, &c. and shall fall away, crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh, &c. The division of the verses having made the Translation not so proper and Grammatical, though yet it hath generally exprest the sense.

C. 7. v. 1. Ὡς ὁ Μελχισεδεκ, &c. Whilst I was long sticking in the interpretation of this place, I by chance happened at length upon *Cunaeus*, who treats purposely of *Melchizedec*, lib. 3. c. 3. de Rep. Heb. from whom (being a person of so eminent a name) I expected to be satisfied in all my doubts; But when I had attentively read him over, I became more incertain then before, or at least not at all edified in my judgment: For he confidently determines contrary to the general opinion of the *Fathers*, and of all later *Interpreters*, that *Jesus* the Son of God was the

Ep. to the Hebrews. 267

the very same *Melchizedec* who met *Abraham*, &c. *Gen. c. 14. being clothed in a humane shape, with a habit of a high Priest and King.* His opinion being fixt in this foundation, *Melchisedeci Sacerdotium à D. Paulo perpetuum atque infinitum constitui, That the Priesthood of Melchizedec was by S^t Paul determined to be infinite and perpetual, because its said, v. 3. that he remains a Priest for ever, and v. 8. that it is witnessed of him that he liveth.* From whence he necessarily concludes, *Si Messiam atque Melchisedecum non esse unum eundemque sed duos credimus, &c. If we believe that the Messias and Melchizedec were not one and the same, but two persons, then must there be two Priests, whose function, circumscribed with no space of years, indures for ever. Which certainly none of the Ancient nor later Interpreters yet ever so much as dreamed of. And if this be not the true and genuine meaning of the words of S^t Paul, there's an end of interpreting the Epistle to the Hebrews, Thus Cuneus.* But when this opinion hath been exploded from all Antiquity unto *Cuneus* his time, so that learned *Beza* stuck not to pronounce them that held it, *apertè Fanaticos, notorious Fanaticks,* I shall use no other argument to refute it, but what *Epiphanius* used of old, *Οὐ γὰρ πρὸς αὐτῷ ὁμοῖον ἔστιν ἡ ἀρχιεπισκοπή, Neque enim sibi ipsi similis appellari quisquam potest, For no man*
can

can be said to be like himself. For to say, that the Son of God was made like unto the Son of God, as it is said, v. 3. or that the Son of God ariseth an high Priest after the likeness of the Son of God, as it is, v. 15. or that God should swear Thou (my Son) art a Priest for ever according to the order or similitude of my Son, as v. 21. Which necessarily follows, if we make *Jesus* and *Melchizedec* one and the same person, is to me so altogether unconceivable, that I cannot but admire the confidence of the person, when I consider his reputation. And therefore I cannot but dissent from his opinion though never so highly priz'd, Confessing my self prone toward the sense of them, who make *Melchizedec* a Type of *Christ*, although I must ingenuously profess I do not understand, however they salve the matter, how it can be said of *Melchizedec*, who as they confess, was a mortal man, in one place, that he remains a Priest for ever, and in another, that it is witnessed of him (by the Scripture for so I understand the word μαρτυρέω in the Apostles phrase) that he liveth. I may perhaps apprehend their meaning who refer these words by way of *Allegory* unto the Son of God, and it may be consonant to my Faith, that it should be so, but it is not so to my sense and reason how it can be so, which it is not just should be led captive without shew of demonstration,

stration, how the thing is done which they say is done, except it be in matters of extream necessity. For it is a safe rule and perpetually good, *Proprie semper sumenda sunt vocabula, nisi quid aliter accipere cogat, alioqui nihil firmum erit in Scriptura*, *Words are always to be taken in their proper sense, unless something necessitate to take them otherwise, else nothing will be firm in Scripture.* Riber. in Heb. But here is no such necessity in this place. For if I be not extreamly mistaken, there is yet an interpretation left, which doth reconcile these apparent difficulties in the Text fairly enough, and also overthrow *Cunaus* his opinion, by rendring and distinguishing the words in another manner, then ever yet they have been, and that without any force to *Grammar* or use of speech among the holy Penmen. To demonstrate this, I must in the first place tell you, that these words, *Οὐτῶν γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδεκ, &c.* *Hic enim Melchisedec, &c.* unto the end of v. 8. cannot be rightly construed and expounded but jointly with the words foregoing, beginning, c. 6. v. 19, 20. *Καὶ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ εἰσώπτερον τοῦ καπατε-
τάσματος, ὅπου προέδρου ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσήλθεν
Ἰησοῦς κατὰ τὰς τάξεις τοῦ Μελχισεδεκ ἀρχιερέως γενό-
μενος εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα, Οὐτῶν γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδεκ, &c.* *Et ingredientem usque in interiora velaminis, &c.* *And which entreth into the inner part of the vail, where the forerunner for us is en-
tered*

tred Jesus, or, where Jesus the forerunner for
 us is entred, being made an high Priest for e-
 ver after the order or similitude of Melchize-
 dec, &c. In the farther explaining whereof
 you are to observe, that the word ἔτϞ is
 not a *Relative* to Μελχισεδὲν, nor to be con-
 strued with it, but to Ἰησοῦς, preceding imme-
 diately before, as also that ὁ Μελχισεδὲν is *Ap-
 positive* to Ἰησοῦς, and ought to be construed
 separately in a *Parenthesis* with the words fol-
 lowing, unto μὴναι ἱερός εἰς τὸ διώκεναι, in this
 manner, ΟὐτϞ γδ (ὁ Μελχισεδὲν, βασιλεὺς Ζα-
 λήμ, ἱερεὺς τῷ δεῦ τῷ ὑψίστῳ, ὁ σωαντήσας Ἀ-
 βραὰμ ὑποσρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κτηνῆς τῆς βασιλείων,
 καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, ὃ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἀπὸ πάντων
 ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραὰμ, πρὶν τὸν μὲν ἐρμηνεύοντο
 βασιλῆος διανομήν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλῆος Ζα-
 λήμ, ὃ ἐστὶν, βασιλῆος εἰρήνης, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ,
 ἀγενεαλόγητϞ, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς
 πλϞ ἔχων, ἀφωμνημῆτϞ δὲ τῷ ὑψίστῳ δεῦ)
 μὴναι ἱερός εἰς τὸ διώκεναι. Hic enim (ipse Mel-
 chisedec rex Salem, &c.) manet Sacerdos in
 perpetuum, For this Jesus (the Melchizedec,
 King of Salem, Priest of the most high God,
 who met Abraham returning from the slaughter
 of the Kings, and blessed him, to whom also
 Abraham gave the tenth part of all, first be-
 ing by interpretation King of righteousness,
 and after that King of Salem, which is King
 of peace, without Father, without Mother, with-
 out descent, having neither beginning of days,

nor

Ep. to the Hebrews. 271

nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God) abideth a Priest continually. ^{OUT} word for word, is *This*, that is, *This man*, or ἀνὸς τῷ ὁμοιω, *Jesus* may be repeated, or understood. Either lawfully. In summ the meaning of the words is this, *For this Jesus, who is entred into the inner part of the vail, &c. c. 6. v. 19, 20. being the Melchizedec* (as it is elsewhere said, *I am the true vine, and that rock was Christ*) that is, prefigured in *Melchizedec*, who was made like unto him, in that he is called the *Priest* of the most high God, *King of righteousness and peace*, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, attributes congruous only to the Son of God, I say, this *Jesus*, according to the true and genuine interpretation of the words, *abideth a Priest continually*, but not *Melchizedec*. But because *Melchizedec* is by *Moses* stiled the *Priest* of the most high God, and the *King of righteousness and peace*, and because neither his *Genealogy*, nor *Birth*, nor *Death* are recorded in *Scripture*, therefore was he a most fit and proper type and figure of the eternal Priesthood and Royalty of *Christ*; and for that cause said to be ἀφωμοιωμενος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, made like unto the Son of God. My arguments for this interpretation are these, *First*, its lawful according to the rules of *Syntax*. *Secondly*, because it accommodates the sense, and renders that place interpretable, which the

Apostle

Apostle was pleased to call Λόγον δυσερμωδ-
τον, Sermonem difficilem explicatu, *A speech*
hard to be interpreted, c. 5. v. 11. *Thirdly*,
because the Article ὁ, may be as well *demon-*
strative, as *expletive*, and in this place rather,
for if it were to be rendred, For this *Mel-*
chizedec, the Article ὁ had been more signi-
ficantly omitted, reading, ἔτι γὰρ Μελχισε-
δὲκ, but because the Article is added, it seems
to intimate, that ἔτι is a *Relative* to Ἰησοῦς
and that the Article ὁ is to be construed with
Melchizedec, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, or ἐμφανικῶς, *The*
Melchizedec. As our learned *Abbot* upon *Psal.*
110. v. 4. *For Jesus Christ indeed is the true*
Melchizedec. In which place he also reads,
Thou art the Priest for ever, as if it were
read, אֵת רַכְהוּ, which reading in it self is law-
ful, and doth more eminently set forth his sin-
gular right to the eternal Priesthood, with ex-
clusion to any other competitor whatsoever.
Fourthly and *Lastly*, this interpretation avoids
two egregious contradictions, the one in na-
ture, that a mortal man should live for ever,
the other in Faith, that there should be two
high Priests that should remain for ever. And
now follows the other difficulty which ar-
iseth from, v. 8. Καὶ ὡς μὲν δεκάτας ἀπο-
θήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβάνουσιν, ἐκεῖ δὲ μέρτυ-
ρέουσιν. ὅτι ζῇ, Et hic quidem decimas acci-
piunt morientes homines, ibi vero (accipit)
de quo testatum est quod vivit, And here
men

Ep. to the Hebrews. 273

men that die receive tythes, but there he that receiveth them, lives for ever. From whence it is concluded without contradiction, that *Melchizedec* is there said to live, because he who receiveth tythes is said to live, but no body in the foregoing words is said to have received tythes but *Melchizedec* who received them from *Abraham*, and therefore it must be *Melchizedec*, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. Whereto it is briefly answered, *First*, that the word [*accipit, receiveth*] is not in the *Greek Text*. *Secondly*, that the *Scripture* doth no where say that *Melchizedec* liveth. What then? is the sense deficient? by no means. It perfectly and formally agrees with the whole order of the *Apostles* discourse both in this Chapter, and the foregoing Chapter and the following, but especially with v. 23, 24, 25. of this instant Chapter, Where we have the self same sense as to the matter, the words only varied. Καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείονες εἰς ἡ-
 γονότες ἱερεῖς, ὅτι τὸ θάνατον καλύπτεται ὡς ἡ-
 μῖναι. Ὁ δὲ ὅτι τὸ μῖναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα,
 ἀσάβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱεροσύνην, &c. And they
 truly were many Priests, because they were not
 suffered by death for to continue, But this man
 because he continueth for ever, hath an ever-
 lasting Priesthood, by reason whereof he is al-
 so able evermore to save them that come unto
 God by him, πάντοτε ζῶν, always living to make
 intercession for them. So that they who re-
 ceive

ceive tythes and die, v. 8. cannot be other then the many Priests who were not suffered by death to remain, v. 23. And he of whom it is witnessed that he liveth, v. 8. cannot be other then the very *Jesus* who is said, v. 24. to remain for ever, and v. 25. *πάντοτε ζῶν*, always living, to make intercession for them. And truly *Heinsius* as to the *το ὅτι*, certainty of the thing, did positively affirm, that necessarily those in v. 8. and those in v. 23, 24, 25. were all one and the same persons, and for confirmation cites *S^t Ambrose* upon v. 8. *Quis est qui vivit? ille etiam qui secundum ordinem Melchisedec factus est Sacerdos in perpetuum, Who is he that liveth? Even he who according to the order of Melchizedec is made a Priest for ever.* But he shews not the *πῶς* manner how the thing is so according to the ordinary way of speech, so that the objection still remains, that howsoever, we may strongly guess that the words, v. 8. are properly meant of *Christ*, yet are they so literally [in common acception] spoken of *Melchizedec*, that they cannot regularly be construed with any other. But to this objection, to clear the matter, I answer, that those words *ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυρεῖται ὅτι ζῇ*, in the common way of *Syntax* properly without any *Allegory*, ought to relate to *Jesus* the Son of God, the *Analogy* and order of the whole discourse unanimously consenting thereunto. As for example,

Ep. to the Hebrews. 275

ὧδε, *Here*, i. e. that is, *in this world*, ἀποθνή-
 σκοντες ἄνθρωποι δεκάτας λαμβάνουσιν. *Men that*
die receive tythes, that is, *are Priests*, for none
 but *Priests* received tythes, so as the terms
 are clearly *Synonymous*, ἐκεῖ δὲ, *but there*, that
 is, *in heaven*, ἐν τῷ ἐσωτέρῳ τῷ καταπατάσμα-
 τι, ὅπου εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, *in the inner part of*
the vail, where Jesus is for us entred, c. 6.
 v. 19, 20. is, [understand ἐστὶ] *he of whom it*
is witnessed that he liveth, to wit, *Jesus*, of
 whom it is witnessed according as it is there cited
 out of *Psal. 110. v. 4. Thou art a Priest for*
ever after the order of Melchizedec, or as the
Syriack and Arabick read, and the *Apostle* in
 this very Chapter, v. 15. according to the si-
 militude of *Melchizedec*. The arguments to
 confirm this interpretation are these. *First*,
 there is nothing in the *New Testament* more
 frequent then to understand the verb, ἐστὶ, *is*,
 you may observe it by the change of the cha-
 racter of the letter in our *English* books al-
 most in every Page, and therefore it is law-
 fully expounded, Ἐκεῖ δὲ ἐστὶ μαρτυρεῖται,
But there is he of whom it is witnessed that he
liveth. *Secondly*, it is not always necessary
 that a word or sentence relate to the next
 antecedent, but often by reason of some di-
 gression or intervenient *Parentheses* to some
 remoter antecedent. Whereof you may see
 examples many, as *Matth. c. 3. v. 16. the*
word, αὐτῷ, him, doth not answer to the next

276 Annotations on the

antecedent, that is, to *Jesus*, in the same verse, but to *John*, v. 14. And *Gal.* c. 2. the *Relative* οἷς, to whom, v. 5. is not a *Relative* to παρεισάκτους ψόδαδελφους, the false brethren, next preceding, v. 4. (as is commonly conceived) but το, τοῖς δοκῶσι, those of reputation, v. 2. whereof you may see *Animad.* upon that place. So *Rom.* c. 1. the seventh verse answereth to the first, whilst in the interim betwixt, there are three *Parentheses*. And *1 Cor.* c. 11. the words v. 33. do perfectly answer to v. 22. the rest of the discourse between being a kind of digression. And such a digression we have in this very *Epistle*, nay, in this very place and matter, for when he had began his discourse concerning *Melchizedec*, c. 5. v. 10. he suddenly diverts into another, which when he had continued unto, c. 6. v. 20. he returns again to that of *Melchizedec*, Non abrupte [as *Estius*] sed molli & artificioso nexu orationis, *Not abruptly but with a smooth and artificial closing of his speech*. The which very thing he seems to have done in this very place whereof we now speak, so that ἐκεῖ οὐκ ἐστὶ μαρτυρέμενος doth not unlawfully answer to ὅπερ εἰπὼν in the former Chapter, the discourse between intervening by digression or *Parenthesis*, which would appear much more plain, did not the troublesome division of the Chapters hinder. Thirdly the *Adverb* of Place, ἐκεῖ there doth most fitly answer to its *Cor-*
rela-

Ep. to the Hebrews. 277

relative, ὅπου, where, as Ὅπου γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θησαυ-
 ρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν, For where
 your treasure is, there will your heart be also,
 Matth. c. 6. v. 21. And, Ὅπου γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ
 σαρξ, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί, For where
 the carcase is there will the Eagles be gathe-
 red together, Matth. c. 24. v. 28. So here,
 Ὅπου ἐσθλάδεν Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ μαρτυρέμενος ὁ π-
 ζῶν, Where Jesus is entred, there is he of whom
 it is witnessed that he liveth. Fourthly, as we
 must acknowledge, that it is most certainly
 true of the word of God, what John saith of
 himself c. 19. v. 35. Ἀληθινὴ αὐτῷ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρ-
 τυρία, His Testimony is true, so may we no
 less confidently affirm, whatsoever is not to
 be found in it, neither can by consequence
 deduced from it, can in no sense be said to
 have its Testimony from it; from whence it
 necessarily follows, that it cannot in this place
 be understood that the Scripture beareth wit-
 ness of Melchizedec, that he liveth, when no
 such thing is to be found in Scripture, or to
 be deduced from it by lawful consequence.
 And to speak the truth, the common argu-
 ment which they use to maintain their expo-
 sition, to wit, Silentium de morte pro vitæ
 Testimonio accipit, The silence of his death he
 takes for a Testimony of his life, I say the ar-
 gument wherewith they endeavour to defend
 this exposition, and that is, Non valeret hoc
 quidem in aliis, sed in Melchisedeco quatenus

est imago Christi, valere debet, *This were not of validity in any else, but in Melchizedec it must be so, because he is the type of Christ,* hath more presumption in it then reason or Authority; And certainly the concession of this interpretation as rational and lawful, induced *Cunaeus* into that vain (in my judgment) opinion, that *Jesus* and *Melchizedec* were one and the same person, and that, as he thought, out of a necessary consequence, that there might not be said to be two *high Priests*, who would remain for ever. *Fifely*, because this very Chapter doth so often testifie that the meaning of the words is so, as you may see, v. 13. *For he of whom these things are spoken* was evidently *Jesus*, our Lord of the tribe of *Juda*, v. 14. But what are the things are spoken of him? to wit, that he is *entred into the inner veil*, that he remains a *Priest for ever*, and that *of him it is witnessed that he liveth*, which is also farther testified, v. 16. v. 23. 24. 25. and v. 28. So that it is more manifest then the *Noon day*, that, [*of whom it is witnessed that he liveth*] cannot possibly be understood of any other then of *Jesus*. *Sixthly* and *lastly*, our interpretation so perfectly accommodates the sense, and reconciles all the difficulties which rise out of the common exposition, that I see no reason why it should not be accepted, especially having nothing in it contrary to *Syntax*, reason or *Scripture*, but agreeing

Ep. to the Hebrews. 279

agreeing to them all, and there being no other way whatever, that can accord the construction and the sense, as far as yet appears.

V. 4. Ὡς καὶ δεκάτις Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐν τοῖς ἀπερδιγμένοις ὁ πατριάρχης. Here is likewise an observable trajection, for Ὡς καὶ δεκάτις ὁ Πατριάρχης Ἀβραὰμ, *Unto whom even the Patriarch Abraham gave the Tenth of the spoils.*

C. 9. v. 1. Το, πᾶν κοσμητὸν, And a worldly sanctuary. It being so here called in *Antithesis* to the heavenly, as it is an *antitype* of the true one into which Christ is entred. And that was heaven it self, not Ἁγία ῥηποποίησις ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἀληθινῶν, *A Sanctuary made with hands the figure of the true one, v. 24.* The *Antithesis* standing thus, *The first Tabernacle had its ordinances of divine service, and a worldly Sanctuary, &c. But Christ is become an high Priest of the good things to come, through a greater and more perfect Tabernacle, ἢ χειροποίητον, τέθειται, ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, not made with hands, that is to say, of this creation, v. 11. not a worldly Sanctuary made with hands, or of an earthly building, but an eternal Sanctuary in the heavens, into which he is entred by his own blood once for all. So that κοσμητὸν, χειροποίητον, and ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, Worldly, made with hands, and of this building or creation, signifie all one and the same.* Whereas some interpret a Tabernacle

not made with hands, that is, of this creation, to be meant of the body or humane nature of *Christ*, because a body is sometime *metaphorically* called *σκῆμα*, a *Tabernacle*, I conceive is not suitable to the scope of the place, nor to the doctrine of our Faith. For first, the *Tabernacle* here mentioned seems rather to be the heavens into or through which *Christ* is said to be *entred to appear in the presence of God for us*, v. 24. as also he is called *our high Priest which is passed into the heavens*, c. 4. v. 14. And Secondly, as it is improper to say, that any humane body, was or was not, *χειροποίητον*, made with hands, so neither can it be truly said, that *Christ* his body or humane nature was not *ταύτης τῆ κτίσεως*, of this creation or world: For to say that *Christ* his body was not of this world, because it was conceived in a supernatural manner, is absurd and frivolous, For *Christ* had his whole humane nature body and soul from his *Mother*, and she from *Adam*, that is, of his creation. Else what becomes of *Athanasius* his Creed? "*Ἀνθρώπου ἐκ τῆ οὐσίας τῆ μητρός*, Man of the substance of his Mother. *Τέλει ἄνθρωπον*, Perfect man of a reasonable soul and humane flesh subsisting. Nay if *Christ's* humane nature were not *ταύτης κτίσεως*, of this world, then are we still in our sins, neither doth his passion at all avail us. We are still more miserable, *Τὸ γὰρ ἀνεξοδότητον, ἀδεξιόπουν*, For what was not
[by

[by Christ] assumed, was by him never healed, as Nazianzen most rightly tells us. But to return, a worldly Sanctuary is a Sanctuary made by the work of man, ὁ ἐπηξεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, which man pitched, and not the true Sanctuary which God pitched in the heavens, c. 8. v. 2. He distinguisheth between the heavenly Sanctuary which God made and not man, of which Christ is the Minister or high Priest, and the Sanctuary that Solomon built by the hand of man, of which those were high Priests that were after the order of Aaron. Neither was Atrium Gentium, The court of the Gentiles, ever called ἅγιον, the Sanctuary or the holy place, which some would have τὸ ἅγιον κοσμητὴν to signifie in this place. Nay the persons to whom the court of the Gentiles was permitted, were expressly forbidden by a publick writing in Greek and Latin Ἐντὸς τοῦ ἁγίου παρῆναι, To come within the Sanctuary or holy place, Josep. de bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 6.

C. 11. v. 1. Ἐστὶ δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑποστάσις, Est autem fides firma expectatio rerum sperandarum, But Faith is the assured expectation of things to be hoped for. In which sense the word ὑποστάσις is often used in holy Scripture. As in this Epistle, c. 3. v. 14. 2 Cor. c. 9. v. 4. Ruth c. 1. v. 12. Ezek. c. 19. v. 5. Lam. c. 3. v. 18. Psal. 39. v. 7. So Schindler, Fides est sperandorum substantia, h. e. expecta-

pectatio, *Faith is the substance of things hoped for, that is, the expectation.* Or, *Faith is the ground or foundation of things hoped for.* For ὑποστάσις is, quo quid fulcitur, *wherewith any thing is supported.* And so hope is truly supported by Faith. For what we do not confidently believe shall ever be, we can never hope to enjoy, and therefore Faith is farther called Πραγματων ἑλεγχ. & βλεπομένων, *The evidence or certain proof of things not seen, yea so certain as if they were already seen.* For ἑλεγχ. in the *Old Glossary*, is, *indiciū or probatio, a demonstration or argument so sure as cannot be refuted.*

V. 4. Καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἐπὶ λαλεῖται. After ἀποθανὼν understand ἔη, by an *Elleipsis* frequent in every Page, as I have often observed. Et propter eam adhuc dicitur esse mortuus, *And for it, that is, for his Faith is he still said to be dead, or, to have died.* Λαλεῖται, prædicatur, *Scal. Is yet spoken of, in our Margin.* For we to this hour say, that *Cain kill'd his brother Abel for his Faith, for which Abel obtained witness that he was righteous*, v. 4. So 1 Joh. c. 3. v. 12. Χάριν τίνος; *Wherefore did Cain kill his brother but because his works were righteous?* But how were they righteous, but by his Faith in *Christ* to come, in assurance whereof he offered of the firstlings of his flock? For his Faith therefore is *Abel* still said to have died,

Ep. to the Hebrews. 283

V. 11. *Ἐἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*, Virtutem accepit ad fundationem seminis, *Through Faith even Sarah also received strength for the foundation of a Seed, &c. which was to be as it follows in the next verse, As the stars of heaven for multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable, in which all the families of the earth were to be blessed, for of that Seed wherewith she became then with Child, came Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world.* Καταβολὴ σπέρματος, as καταβολὴ κόσμου, *The Foundation of the world, Revel. c. 13. v. 8. and c. 17. v. 8. and elsewhere, καταβολή, dicitur, cum res aliqua sumit exordium, &c. Hieron. it is called, καταβολή, when any thing takes its beginning.* But by what *Phylosophy, Logick, Grammar or Dictionary*, it can be possibly Translated, that *she received strength to conceive a Seed*, I confess is beyond my learning or capacity. Why it should be therefore so universally accepted, I cannot but wonder, whenas the sense as now Translated, is so proper, and the use of the word so fit and common.

V. 37. *Ἐπειράθη*, Tentati sunt, *Were tempted. As Job, Schol. Græc. as Abraham and Isaac, Theodoret.* But our late Writers, as also some of the Ancient are of another opinion, and therefore say, that the word is crept into the Text imperitia amanuensis, *by the unskilfulness of the Transcriber*, or that it is
not

not written as it should be, either by the oversight of the Apostle, or the Scribe. For because it would be a Tautology to say ἐπειράδι, they were tempted, when immediately before tis said, πείραν ἔλαβον, they had trials or temptations of cruel mockings and scourgings, &c. and because there are words of each hand denoting some kind of death, they think it probable, either that the word should not be read at all, as it is omitted by Chrysostom, the Syriack and Ethiopick Interpreters, and others; or that, if it be read, it ought to be understood in some notion whereof there was no mention made before, and which signifies some kind of death. And from hence some have been moved to read ἐπυράδι, others ἐπυράδισαν, were burned. But if there be any leave for conjecture, perhaps it should have been rather written, Ἐπέρδισαν. ἐλιδάδισαν, ἐπερίδισαν, ἐπέρδισαν, They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were pierced through, a kind of death so known in those days, either by Spear or Stake, that it is scarce to be believed that the Apostle in this place could possibly escape it, when he reckons up so many several kinds of death, which the Christians in those times, and the Prophets of old suffered for the Faith; among which Nicephorus and Eusebius out of the Writings of Dionysius of the Martyrs of Alexandria, mention the transverberation or piercing through
of

of the bowels with stakes, which with Phavorinus is called ἀνασκολοπίζειν. Τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν τὸς κακῶν ἡρώτων ἀνασκολοπίζον, ὁξύνοντες ξύλον ὃ καὶ τὸ ῥάχους τῷ νώτῳ, καὶ ὡς περ τὸς ὀπιομύους ἰχθύας ἐπὶ ὀβελίσκων, For anciently they thrust or pierced through malefactors, striking a sharp stake through the back bone, as they do fishes which are roasted on a spit. Ἀναπείρατε, κεντίσσετε, Hesyc. and Suid.. Φέρετε τὸς ὀβελίσκους ἐν ἀναπείῳ τὰς κύναις, ut transfigam turdos, Aristoph. and so verubus transfixa exta, Ovid. and perhaps so meant Homer, ἀμφ' ὀβελῶϊσαν ἔπειρε, transfixit verubus.

C. 12 v. 24. Καὶ αἷματι βαντισμῷ κρείττονα λαλοῦσι ὥστε καὶ Ἀβελ, And to the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things, then Abel, as some, or then that of Abel, as others, meaning the sprinkling; or as some copies read, ὥστε τοῦ, and then is meant the blood of Abel, or as the Interlineary in our Polyglot Bible, Sanguine aspersiois, in the Ablative. And then the meaning's thus, And to Jesus the Mediatour of the new covenant, and who by his blood of sprinkling speaketh better things than Abel. But read you which way you please, the sense is still the same. And that is this, That the Sacrifice or Oblation which Christ offered on the Cross by the sprinkling or effusion of his blood, did speak better things to the pacifying or atonement of the wrath of God, then did the Sacrifice or Offering of Abel, or then the

the blood spake, which *Abel* offered unto *God* for a Sacrifice, which was a true *type*, and of all the first, of that Sacrifice which in the fulness of time *Christ* offered on the Cross by the effusion of his blood, and for this very thing, because *Abel* the first of all men living offered an offering to the *Lord* of the firstlings of his flock, whereby he testified his Faith in *Christ* to come and offer himself an oblation for the sins of the whole world, doth *God* altogether seem to have respect to *Abel* and to his offering. For by Faith is *Abel* said to have offered unto *God* a better Sacrifice than *Cain*, c 11. v. 4. and for this Faiths sake did he obtain a Testimony that he was righteous. When therefore that Sacrifice of *Abel* was but a *type* or shadow of that great sprinkling of blood which taketh away the sins of the world, it is no more to be compared with it which is the substance of the shadow, then is a picture to be compared with the living person whom it represents. Concerning which disproportion you may observe more, c. 9. v. 13, 14. and 23. So that ♂ or ♀ "Αβελ in this place denotes nothing else but the rites and offerings of the *Old Testament*, one example being put for all. As if he should say, The blood of *Christ* speaks better things, that is, more available to the appeasing of the wrath of *God* for our sins, then either *Abel*, or *Moses*, or all the Sacrifices and Oblations of all the

Ep. to the Hebrews. 287

the *Patriarchs*. That *Christ* his blood was præfigured in the Sacrifice of *Abel*, to be shed for the sins of all mankind, and that the *Patriarchs* before the Law was given, when they Sacrificed the blood of beasts, had a respect to the *Saviour* of the world, I think, there's no Divine but doth assent to, Modern or Ancient. Instead of all, I shall use but one Testimony thereto out of *Eusebius*, *Demonst. lib 1. c. 10.* where speaking of *Noah* and the rest of the *Patriarchs* before *Moses*, he hath these words, *Οι παλαια θεοφιλες, &c.* *The Anciently beloved of God foreseeing by a divine spirit that some extraordinary Sacrifice pretious in the sight of God would one day come to men, that should expiate the sins of the whole world, did in the mean while perform or act its signs and figures, as Prophets typically expressing that which was to come.* But to say that the blood of *Christ* speaks better things than the blood of *Abel* which cries to heaven for vengeance, to speak modestly, agrees not with the scope of the place, it having been the *Apostles* great labour to demonstrate how invalid the *Ceremonies* of the old Law were to acquire eternal life, and how much in that respect the covenant of the *New Testament* was beyond that of the *Old*, as is evidently apparent by the whole series of his discourse, c. 9, and 10. But to speak the very truth, with reverence to *Antiquity*, that exposition is contrary to the very rules of *Logick*.
For

For Comparata oportet esse secundum majus & ejusdem speciei & naturæ, *Things compared ought to be according to more or less, of the same species and nature.* So as in a comparison of betterness, the one may be said in some measure to be good for that end for which the other is said to be better. So *Chrysostom*, although he hit not the meaning in this place so luckily, upon those words κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ πάντας, *better Sacrifices then these. c. 9. v. 23.* saith, Τὸ κρεῖττον καλὸν πινός ἐστι κρεῖττον, &c. *That which is better, is better then that which is good, therefore the types of those things which are in heaven are good, for if the types were evil, then would those things whereof they are a type be evil also.* But to cry for vengeance, and to cry for grace, are the whole heavens different and contrary natures. Neither can the blood of *Christ* be said to be better then the proper blood of *Abel*, which was not at all good, no not typically to that intent and purpose to which *Christ* his blood was, to wit, for the redemption of mankind, and the expiation of the sins of the whole world. That therefore this comparison may agree with it self, it is unavoidably necessary, that here be meant the *Sacrifice* of *Abel*, which through Faith he offered unto *God*, which with the *Sacrifice* of *Christ* is not to be compared.

ANNOTATIONS

On the General Ep.

Of S. James.

Ch. 3. v. 1.

MH' πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, Nolite
multi fieri doctores, *Do not many
of you become teachers.* That is,
do not many of you affect the
gift of preaching, *knowing that we, [who are
so] shall receive the greater judgment.* A fa-
miliar trajection, for Μὴ πολλοὶ γίνεσθε διδά-
σκαλοι.

V. 3. Τῶν ἵππων τὲς χαλινὰς εἰς τὰ στόματα
βάλλομεν. Here is another trajection likewise,
for Τὲς χαλινὰς εἰς τὰ στόματα τῶν ἵππων βάλ-
λομεν, Fræna immittimus in ora equorum,
*We put bits into the mouths of horses, as if
it were purposely affected for the elegance.*
You have also the like observable trajection,
c. 2. v. 1: Τὴν πίστιν τὴν κρεῖν ἡμεῖς Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ τὴν δόξην, for τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
τὴν κρεῖν ἡμεῖς τὴν δόξην, *Have not the Faith of*
U Je.

Jesus Christ our Lord of Glory with respect of persons.

C. 4. v. 5, 6. Ἡ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει, πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατῴκησεν ἐν ἡμῖν, μείζονα δὲ δίδωσι χάριν, διὸ λέγει, ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν. From the consideration of the construction of these words it seems to me necessarily to follow, that the first *δίδωσι*, and *λέγει* next following, can agree with no other word then *γραφῇ*, and that they must be therefore rendered thus, *Or do you think the Scripture saith in vain, That the spirit which dwelleth in us lusteth to envy? But it giveth a greater grace, for that it saith, God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.* The sense and coherence being thus, He adviseth them against strife and envying, against wars and fightings, which he tells them *proceed from their lusts*, for confirmation whereof he produceth a Testimony of Scripture. *Do you think the Scripture saith in vain, the Spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?* as if it had said, these bitter envyings come from the lusts of the spirit that is within us. Surely no. The Scripture saith it not in vain. The spirit of man is carried on with passion unto envy, and from thence it comes, because he cannot enjoy what the lust of his eye desires, he endeavours to satisfy his lust by obtaining his desires by force. But the Scripture tendereth a more gracious com-

comfort, when it saith that *God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace, that is, sheweth favour to the humble.* Intimating thereby, that though we be naturally prone to strife and envy, yet if we humble our selves before God, to which he exhorts us in the following words, he will shew favour to us. Where this *Scripture* is in exprefs words, I cannot tell, but among the Writings of the *Prophets* which are lost. As elsewhere the *Apostle Paul* citeth words of our *Saviours*, which we no where read that he ever spake, *It is more blessed to give then to receive*, Act. c. 20. v. 35.

C. 5. v. 9. Μὴ στενάζετε κατ' ἀλλήλων, *No-
lite ingemiscere in alterutrum, as the Old La-
tin, Ne lugete invicem, Bemoan not one ano-
ther.* He bids them in the former verses to be *patient and to establish their hearts*, be-
cause the coming of the *Lord* was at hand. And here he again exhorts them; not to lose their courage, and to bemoan one another, least for their impatience they might be blamed. For behold the *Judge* is before the doors, the *Lord* is at hand. Take ye therefore the *Prophets* for examples of suffering affliction and patience. Κα στενάζω, is cum gemitu deploro, to bewail with lamentation. As, Καταστενάζω τὴ ἐμαυτῇ ψυχῇ, *I bewail my own Soul*, Basil. in which sense you have κατασενῶ in *Euripides*. Μὴ στενάζετε κατ' ἀλλήλων, is all one as if he had said, Μὴ καταστενάζετε
U 2 ἀλλή-

292 *Annotations on the*

ἀλλήλων. For κτ̃ with a *Genitive*, signifieth *super, over*. *Bewail or lament not one over another*. As for the common reading, *Grudge not one against another*, methinks, it agrees not at all with the scope of the place.

ANNOTATIONS

On the I. Ep. General

Of S. Peter.

Ch. 3. v. 20, 21.

EΙΣ ὡς ὀλίγα (τετρίσιν ὀκτώ) ψυχὰς
 διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος, ὃ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀντι-
 τυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα (ἢ σαρκὸς
 δόξασις ῥύπτι ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς
 ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν) δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
 As the words are thus commonly pointed and
 distinguish't, it is very hard to give them a
 commodious sense and a Grammatical constru-
 ction. For which cause *Beza* would have this
 place amended out of the *Complutense* Edi-
 tion, affirming that in other copies, ὃ or ὁμο-
 κρον, is corruptly read for ὡ, ὡμέρα as it is
 in

in that. And him for a great part our late Expositors do follow, though there be an *old copy* also in *Oxford* that readeth δ instead of σ , which our *Learned D^r Hammond* is pleased to follow. The *Syriack*, to salve the doubt, before σ understood χ , according to which, perhaps lawfully enough. But there may be no less question in another phrase of this period, for according to the common use of words, it is not properly said, *Octo animas servatas esse per aquam*, *That eight Souls were saved by water*, as the word $\delta\lambda\alpha$ was constantly understood by the *Greeks*. Though *Beza* to remedy this difficulty also, will have $\delta\lambda\alpha$ in this place to signifie, *In*, that is, in his Country language, *parmi le'au*, in or amidst the water. And to confirm his Judgment he cites a precedent, *Rom. c. 4. v. 11.* where he would have $\delta\iota' \alpha\chi\epsilon\rho\beta\upsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ to signifie, in præputio, *in uncircumcision*, whereas $\epsilon\nu \tau\eta \alpha\chi\epsilon\rho\beta\upsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha$ is three times used by the *Apostle* in the same and the foregoing verse, but truly I see no such urgency in that place to alter the proper signification of the *Preposition*, it being as good if not much better sense to Translate it, as the *Old Latin* doth, *Per præputium*, *By his uncircumcision*, according to the common acception of the word. The meaning of the place being this, *That Abraham received the sign of Circumcision the seal of the righteousness of Faith in uncircumcision*, that $\delta\iota' \alpha\chi\epsilon\rho\beta\upsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$, by his

uncircumcision he might be the Father of all believers, righteousness also being imputed unto them. Δι' ἀκερβυσίας, being to be Transposed thus, Εἰς ὃ ἦν αὐτὸν δι' ἀκερβυσίας πατέρα πάντων τῶν πισεύοντων, and not to be construed with πισεύοντων, as commonly it is, to the obscuring of the *Emphasis* of the sense. Which is surely this, His circumcision was the seal of his Faith when he was yet uncircumcised, for a sign, that by his uncircumcision, that is, by his Faith when he was yet not circumcised, he might become the Father of all believers throughout the world that are not circumcised. However, this interpretation of Beza's is not only rare, but likewise not much suitable to this place. Let us therefore with leave inquire, whether these very words without altering at all the common reading (for neither, ὦ, nor ἦ, nor ὁ being all of the *Masculine* or *Neuter* gender do or can agree with κισωτῶ which is of the *Feminine*, as in their sense who would so read they ought to do) only varying the points, and understanding, ἐστὶ, which is so frequent, and taking away the latter *Parenthesis*, may not yield a truer and better sense than they did before. Εἰς ἃ ὀλίγα (τετρίσιν ὀκτώ) ψυχὰς διεσώθησαν. Δι' ὕδατος ὃ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, ἢ σαρκὸς ἀποδείξαι ῥύπον, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεὸν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, In diebus Noë, cum fabricaretur Arca
in

in qua paucæ (id est Ocho) animæ servatæ sunt. Per aquam etiam quod est antitypum nos nunc servat Baptisma, non depositio sordium carnis sed bonæ conscientiæ stipulatio in Deum per Resurrectionem Jesu Christi, *In the days of Noah when the Ark was preparing, wherein few (that is Eight) Souls were saved. By water also Baptism which is the Antitype doth now save us. Not the doing away the filth of the flesh, but the covenant of a good conscience toward God by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* And thus by this Translation the unwonted use of ὅ in the former sense is avoided, and the Article ὁ doth fitly answer to the word, βάπτισμα. Neither is the trajection harsh at all, as some perhaps may object, δι' ὕδατος ὁ καὶ ἡμῶν, for δι' ὕδατος καὶ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐστὶν ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, *By water also Baptism which is the Antitype [to the Ark of Noah wherein Eight Souls were saved] doth now save us.* Is there not the same trejection, if you read ὁ or ἑ? Nay it is so far from being insolent, as it rather seemeth elegant and pleasing, for as *Stephanus* affirms, *Demosthenes* the great Orator was wont to use such trajections ad venustatem sermoni conciliandam, to gain a grace unto his speech. That others also of the *Greeks*, and the *Latins* also for the same cause did the like, as you may see, *Animad. on Act. c. 13. v. 17.* And perhaps the very *Apostles* themselves, is not

strange at all. You have one in this very place, 'Ου σαρὴς ἀπόδεσις ῥύπης, for, ὃ ῥύπης σαρὴς ἀπόδεσις, and another in the same *Apostle*, 2 Ep. c. i. v. 19. ὃ καλῶς ποιεῖτε ὡροσέχοντες, for ὃ ὡροσέχοντες καλῶς ποιεῖτε. But if you would see more perplex and involv'd trajections, you may consult as I said before, *Act. c. 13. v. 17*. In summ the sense is this, *Baptism* which doth now save us by water, and is an *Antitype* to the Ark of *Noah*, is not the doing away of the filth of the flesh Δι' ὕδατος, *By water*, but the covenant or promise of a good conscience toward God Δι' ἀναστάσεως 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *By the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, so as there is a clear *Analogy* between Δι' ὕδατος, and Δι' ἀναστάσεως, a due proportion between, *By water*, and *By the Resurrection*. As if he should have said, That the Ark of *Noah* (not the flood) was a *type* of *Baptism*, and *Baptism* an *antitype* to the Ark, but not because that *Baptism* was a *cleansing of the filth of the flesh by water*, in which respect it had no resemblance with the Ark, but in that it was the *stipulation of a good conscience toward God by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, in the Faith whereof and a life proportionable toward God, we are now saved, as they of old time were in the Ark of *Noah*. For the Ark of *Noah* and *Baptism* are both *types* and figures of the Resurrection. So that the proper end of *Baptism* is not to be understood as if it were a wash-

washing away of our sins, which is signified by the doing away the filth of the flesh, (although it necessarily follows and is so often *Metonymically* taken by the *Fathers*) but *we* properly it is the sign of Resurrection from death in sin to newness of life by a true and lively Faith in the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, whereof *Baptism* was a most *Emphatick* figure, as was also the Ark of *Noah*, out of which he returned as it were from the Sepulchre of death to a new life, and therefore is of *Philo* not unfitly termed *παλιγγενεσίας ἡγεμονία*, *The Captain or Leader of regeneration*, and so was the *Whales belly* out of which *Jonas* rose after a three days burial, and the *Cloud*, and the *Red Sea* in which the people of *Israel* were all *Baptised*, 1 Cor c. 10. v. 2. All which were *types* and figures of the same thing with *Baptism*, to wit, of the death and Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, it being reputed an *Apostolique* constitution, *καταδυσις, &c.* Demersio in aquâ denotat mortem, emerisio ex aquâ Resurrectionem Christi simul & nostram, *The demersion in the water signifies the death, the emersion out of it the Resurrection of Christ and also of us.* So as by the leave of *Interpreters* who are of another Judgment, I for my part think, that in these words is more *Emphatically* and expressly set forth what *Baptism* meaneth, both negatively and affirmatively, then in any other place of *Scripture*,

as if our *Apostle* did it of purpose to rectifie our Judgments concerning the true notion of *Baptism*. I say negatively and affirmatively. *Negatively*, that it is not *doing away the filth of the flesh* δι' ὑδατῶν, by the efficacy of water, the outward sign of the inward thing, to wit, the mystical washing away of sin, into which sense very obvious for the near affinity of the use of water we are so prone to run into. For it is a cold exposition of them who say, that *the doing away the filth of the flesh* doth signifie the outward act of washing only, as if any man could be saved by the outward act, unless the inward thing be applied by Faith, to wit, the remission or doing away of sin. *Affirmatively and positively*, that it is *the stipulation or promise of a good conscience toward God by the virtue of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. And I conceive this sense concerning *Baptism* to be most consonant and agreeable to the Judgment of the *Fathers*, who if they notwithstanding did apply *Baptism* to that other notion of washing, they did it *accidentally*, and *by the by*, because of the *Allegorical* allusion of the element of water to the bloud of *Christ*, which is said to cleanse us from our sins, 1 *Joh. c. i. v. 7*. But more surely there is in this word of *Baptism* according to *Athanasius*, μεῖζον βάπτισμα, a deeper mystery then that of washing, a mystery known and common to the very Heathen, as
their

their frequent *lustrations* do sufficiently witness. But as concerning the Resurrection of the body, it was a thing to them unknown and incredible, if not altogether imperceptible, [nay some of the *Jews* themselves did not believe it.] It was the speech of one of their great *Philosophers*, *Seneca* by name, *Hora illa decretoria non est animo suprema sed corpori*, The determinate hour, of death, is not the last to the soul, but to the body. It was no small matter to reach the immortality of the Soul, the top of their knowledge, but of the Resurrection of the body *Philosophers* scarce ever dreamed of. *Mornæus* tells us of *Zoroastres*, who is of some reported to have held this opinion, *Quod animæ immortales sunt, & quod corporum Resurrectio universalis futura*, That Souls are immortal, and that there shall be a universal Resurrection of bodies. But this, but, à plerisque profertur, many say so, but no certainty thereof. And *Lactantius* tells us of *Chrysippus* who had an imperfect notion of it, the summ whereof was this. That after death within some period of time, εἰς ὅν τινα χρόνον ἀποκαταστήσεαι ὡς ἔστις, we should be restored into the same form wherein we now are. But who knows whether he meant the same Numerical body, or whether by this same form he mean not the Soul, as the rest of the *Philosophers* did, or whether he meant not rather the *Pythagorean Metempsychosis*? But this I say
was

was a greater mystery then that *Allegorical* washing of the Soul by which its said to be cleansed by the blood of *Christ*. The notion of Resurrection was far higher, the very life and *mystery of Christian Religion*, as *Zonaras* calls it. It is indeed the stupendious mystery of mysteries, wherein to believe consists the foundation of eternal happiness. That *Christ* the *Mediatour* should become θεῶν υἱός, *God and man*, to be declared *man* in that he died, and to be declared *God* in that he rose again from the dead, *Rom. c. i. v. 4*. This I say again was a mystery beyond all *Philosophical Speculation*, and therefore there was need of some significant *type* or figure, which might make so impenetrable a notion familiar and perceptible to the sense of man, to which purpose nothing seemed more fit and easie in the wisdom of *God*, then the burying of our bodies in water by *Baptism*, from whence they receive an immediate Resurrection. So that in conclusion we may positively affirm. that *Baptism is properly and solely a type of the Resurrection*. And to this truth do give their suffrage, The *Apostles*, *Fathers*, *Schoolmen*, almost all *Interpreters*, *Ancient* and *Modern*, and even our *English Church* it self, its Judgment being manifest in the *Rubrick* of the *Common Prayer*, which injoyns the dipping of *Infants* in *Baptism*, allowing only in some cases the liberty of *sprinkling*, or *perfusion*. The thing

thing of it self is so manifest, that there is no need of Testimonies to confirm it ; but because there be not few who teach otherwise, led thereunto by example and vulgar error, it will not be amiss, if but to free my self from the imputation of too much confidence, out of innumerable Testimonies, to cite some few, And we first begin from the *Apostle Paul*,
*Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθητε, &c. Know ye not that so many as were Baptised into Jesus Christ, were Baptised into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the Father of Glory, even so we also should walk in newness of life, &c. Rom. c. 6. v. 3, 4. &c. Συμπάρεντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισματι, &c. Being buried with him in Baptism, wherein you are also risen with him through Faith of the working of God who hath raised him from the dead, Col. c. 2. v. 12. Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν, &c. Else what shall they do who are Baptised for dead [bodies] if the dead rise not? 1 Cor. c. 15. v. 29. As much as if he had said, In vain doth the Church use the sign of Baptism if there be no Resurrection. You have it abundantly proved also in the Primitive and later Writers. For example, That believing on his death, Ἐὰν τὸ βαπτισμα-
 τος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἀναστήσωμεν αὐτὸ γέννηται, By his Baptism ye may be made partakers of his Resurrection, Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. Βαπτισμα
 eis*

εἰς τὸ θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου δίδωμεν, *Baptism was given to set forth the death of the Lord, Ep. ad Philadel. in the name of Ignatius. The death of Christ, Const. Apost. Τὸ πάθος καὶ τὴν ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελοῦμεν τὰ σύμβολα, In Baptism we perform the signs of his Passion and Resurrection, Just. Mar. We know one saving Baptism, since there is but one death for the world and one Resurrection, ἐν τύπῳ ἐστὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, whereof Baptism is the type, &c. Basil. Mag. Hear what S^t Paul saith, They were all Baptised in the cloud and in the sea, Βάπτισμα καλεῖ τὴν θάλατταν ὁδόν, He calleth their passage through the sea, Baptism, for it was an escape from death, &c. Basil. Se-leuc. Ὅταν μέλλομεν βαπτίζειν, When we go about to Baptize, we bid to say, I believe in the Resurrection of the dead, and in this Faith are we Baptized, Chrysost. Baptismus Resurrectionis pignus, & imago, Baptism is a pledge and figure of the Resurrection, Ambr. Baptismus arrhabo Resurrectionis, Baptism is an earnest of the Resurrection, Lactant. Aquarum elemento sepelimur, We are buried in the element of water, Anselm. Mersio mortis & sepulturæ formam gerit, Immersion bears the form of death and burial, Bernard. Laudabilius, & tutius, & communius, &c. Baptism is performed more laudably, more safely and more commonly by dipping, for by dipping the figure of Christ his burial is represented, Tho. Aquin.*

Ipsū Baptizandi verbum mergere significat, &c. The word Baptism doth signifie dipping under the water, and it is evident the Ancient Church used the Ceremony of dipping, Calv. Baptismus Græca vox est, &c. Baptism is a Greek word and signifies properly, immersion into the water, and this signification doth properly agree with our Baptism, and hath Analogy to the thing signified, for by Baptism we are buried together and as it were drowned with Christ being dead to sin, &c. Zanch. I could add to these an innumerable heap of Testimonies, but these I think are enough to prove two irrefragable doctrines, First, that Baptism is properly and solely, the type of the death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Faith wherein we are assured of the humanity and Godhead of our Saviour, the very foundation of our Christian Faith. And Secondly, of the Resurrection of all true Christians, who are Baptized in, and live according to that Faith, knowing that if they shall rise from the death of sin to newness of life, they shall also after death with Christ arise to glory. I shall only add the Judgment of an ingenuous and learned man, whose Testimony in this matter is not to be suspected or refused. His words are these, Porro quamvis immersionis Cæremonia & olim fuit communior, &c. Though the Ceremony of immersion was anciently more common, as appears by the unanimous discourse of the Fathers when they

they speak of this matter, and doth more lively represent the death, burial, and Resurrection of the Lord and us, which are mystically done in Baptism. The which signification of immersion the Fathers do often urge, &c. From whence S^t Thomas affirms that the Ceremony or rite of dipping is the most commendable, Yet there have been many reasons for which sometimes it was convenient to change this custom of dipping into some other kind of Ceremony near unto it, &c. From hence therefore the Ceremony of perfusion or pouring on of water as middle between sprinkling and dipping was much in use, which custom Bonaventure saith was in his time much observed in the French Churches and some others, though he confesses the Ceremony of dipping was the more common, the more fit, and the more secure, as S^t Thomas teacheth. However where the custom of perfusion, or aspersion, sprinkling of, or pouring on of the water is now in use, it ought not to be altered by private Authority. Nay since now it is so generally in practise throughout the Church, it ought by no means to be call'd in question. Thus far Estius. In whose words we have a manifest and ingenious concession, that dipping was the Ancient Ceremony, which constantly the Fathers taught, as more lively representing the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ and us, that the Schoolmen held the same for the most secure and commendable custom, that the

the custom of *perfusion* crept in unawares into the *Church*, for what causes he mentions not. But because the custom hath been long in use, he doth not think it fit it should be called into question. whether it be lawful or no. And to this Judgment I willingly subscribe, so as the Ministers of *Baptism* would teach the true and genuine reason of its institution, which by the change of the *Ceremony* is almost lost, so that they for the most part teach now a days that *Allegorical* one of washing, occasioned by the now constant custom of *perfusion*, which I will not yet deny may be piously and profitably taught sometimes, for the *Fathers* and the *Apostles* themselves did sometimes do it. Though, with leave be it spoken, I am still of opinion, that it would be more for the honour of the *Church*, and for the peace and security of Religion, if the old custom could conveniently be restored, which surely it might safely enough in respect of indangering the health of the Infants, if *Baptism* were only to be administred at set times in the year, as it was Antiently in the *Church*. Which custom what should hinder to be revived I do not see, but the opinion of those, who hold *Baptism* so necessary to Salvation, as that without it there's none to be hoped for, and yet in danger of death, there might be a liberty allowed for it at other times. The case then being thus, I beseech you what so visible affi-

nity is there between burial and washing, that *Christian Baptism* should be thought to draw its Original from the *lotions* or *washings* of the *Jews*? If it were true that our *Baptism* did signifie washing or ablution, or were it true that the *Jews* did Anciently admit into their Church either their Own or Profelytes by collation of Baptism, which hath been so much urged by Learned men, they might be probable arguments, that the institution of our *Baptism* was fetch't from the *Baptismes* or *washings* of the *Jews*. But when the contrary is made so evident concerning the first, and there appears no certainty for the second, I conceive there is little reason to adhere to this new and uncertain doctrine which the *Fathers* never heard or dreamed of. For that our *Baptism* is truly a *type* of burial, and Resurrection, literal and mystical, and not of washing, hath been already sufficiently declared. And as for the other argument, as it is far off from any cogency in it to force the assent, so is it liable to very much question, it having so little help of the Authority of *Scripture* to defend it, that I can scarce find any footsteps of it in the *Old Testament*. They would derive its Original from the word כִּבֵּי, *lavit* or *purgavit*, to wash or cleanse, *Exod. c. 19. v. 10*. But as I take it the *Rabbins* use for *Baptism* the word טָבַל, which signifies dipping or immersion, thereby notably shewing that they owe

owe the notion of the word to the *Greeks*, or rather to the *Christians*. For what affinity is there so near between *purgation*, and *immersion*, *cleansing* and *dipping*? But the thing of it self was so uncertain that the *Masters* themselves did disagree about it. For in the very Text they urge which is cited out of the *Talmud*, *Rabbi Eliezer* doth expressly contradict *Rabbi Joshua*, who was the first as far as I can learn that ever did assert this kind of *Baptism* among the *Jews*. For *Rabbi Eliezer* who was at least *coetaneous* if not elder to *Rabbi Joshua*, expressly saith, *Profelytum circumcisum & non Baptizatum verum esse Profelytum*, nam sic legimus de patribus, *Abrahamo*, *Isaaco*, & *Jacobo*, qui circumcisi erant & non Baptizati, *That a Profelyte circumcised and not Baptized was a true Profelyte*, for so we read of our Fathers *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, who were *Circumcised* and not *Baptized*. On the other side *Rabbi Joshua* affirms, *Eum qui Baptizatus est & non circumciscus esse Profelytum*, *That he was a Profelyte who was Baptized and not circumcised*, But to which of these shall I yield my belief? To *Eliezer* who affirms that which the *Scripture* affirms, or to *Joshua* who affirms that which the *Scripture* nowhere mentions? 'Tis true the *Masters* stood all for *Rabbi Joshua*, it was their interest so to do, it was for the honour of their Religion that the *Christians* might be said to borrow their

Ceremonies from them. But when I see learned and judicious persons in these times fetch the foundations of truth from the *Rabbins*, and that to establish a new opinion, I cannot but wonder at it. Unde nobis missus est Talmudus, &c. They are the words of *Buxtorfius* in his *Synag. Jud.* From whence was the *Talmud* sent us, that we should give it so much credit, as to believe that the Law of Moses could or ought to be understood by it? And if not the Law of Moses, much less the Law of the Gospel to which they were professed enemies. The *Talmud* is called by the same Author, Errorum Labyrinthus, & tabularum Judaicarum fundamentum, *The Labyrinth of errors, and the foundation of Jewish Fables*, and it was first perfected and acknowledged to be Authentick Five Hundred years after Christ, and out of it *Maimonides* and all the rest did suck their learning. Surely therefore there's little reason to acquiesce in its Authority, or Testimony. But what was the matter that this old *Rabbin* should so constantly deny that which was like to advance the honour of his Religion, but that his conscience was thoroughly convinc'd of his assertion? I cannot but admire the ingenuity of the man who maintained the light of this truth so firmly against and amidst so many Impostours of his Nation, who perhaps thought it a Glorious Triumph to obtrude a counterfeit opinion upon the innocent world

world not yet solicitous of their machinations. And that which moves me more, *Josephus* himself [not to speak of all the *Fathers* before the *Talmud*] who was likewise a *Jew* and of the same age with *Rabbi Eliezer*, who writ also purposely of the customs and *Ceremonies* of his Nation, is totally silent in this matter, so that it is an argument to me next to demonstration, that two persons of such eminency, both *Jews*, and *coeval*, the one should expressly deny, the other in all his History make no mention of this *Baptism*. Besides if *Baptism* in the sense of our days had been in use among the *Jews* in former times, wherefore did the *Pharisees* say to *John the Baptist*, *Joh. c. 1. v. 25. Why then Baptizest thou, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, nor that Prophet?* Do they not plainly intimate thereby, that there was no use nor practise of *Baptism* before, and that it was a received opinion among them, that there was none to be used till *Elias*, or that *Prophet* came? Such a solemn and publick merstation was altogether unusual with the *Jews* till that time, as *Grotius* saith upon the words aforementioned. How then there can be any such affinity between our *Baptism* and the washings of the *Jews*, that the one should therefore by any pretext or right be said to succeed the other, I confess I understand not, it is beyond my Faith. But they say that *Arrian* calls the *Jew*, βαπτισμῶν,

ῥῆγον, that is, *one that's dipt*, but I rather think with his Commentator, *Ipsū confuse loqui, & velle potius Christianum Judæum, That he [being a Heathen] spake confusedly or promiscuously, and that he rather meant a Christian Jew, as Lubin also upon that of Juvenal,*

Nunc sacri fontis nemus & delubra locantur Judeis.

will have the *Jews* there to be meant the *Christians*, Qui edicto Domitiani urbe pulsi sylvas illas habitare cogebantur, *Who being by Domitians Edict expell'd the City, were forc'd to inhabit those woods which were sacred to the Heathenish devotions.* But to put an end to this discourse, I do affirm with *Alexander de Halys*, Tinctio est formalis causa Baptismi, *That dipping is the formal cause of Baptism.* There remaineth only to resolve what ἐπερώτημα is. Concerning which word I conceive with *Beza*, *Grotius*, *Estius*, and others, that in this place it properly signifies, stipulatio, a covenant or promise. As it is interpreted by the *Glossaries*, ἐπερώτημα, and ἐπερωτώμεν, stipulatio, ἐπερωτώμεν, *Promitto spondeo, stipulor.* In which sense I conceive ἐρωτήμα is also to be taken, *Sirac. c. 33. v. 3.* Ἀνθρώπου σωτηρίας ἐμπισδός νόμος, καὶ ὁ νόμος αὐτῷ πρὸς, ὡς ἐρωτήμα δ' ἡγίων, *Homo f. nsatus credet legi, & lex ei fidelis, sicut sponsio vel stipulatio iustum,*

I. Ep. of S^t Peter. 311

rum, *A man of understanding will trust the Law, and the Law will be Faithful unto him, as the promise or covenant of the Just.* Tis true, It properly signifies, *rogatio*, but as *rogatio legis* among the *Latins* was used for *legis latio*, and for the Law it self, and *rogare legem*, for *legem ferre* or *statuere*, because it was the custom that the Magistrate when at any time a Law was to be enacted, did ask the people, *Rogaret populum, Velitis, jubeatis ne Quirites hoc fieri?* *Do you desire or will, that this be a Law?* upon whose answer that they did, the Law was publish'd, and this was called *rogatio legis*, or the *enacting of a Law*, so was *ῥωτιμα* and *ἐπερωτιμα* with the *Greeks*, though properly it signifies *rogatio*, for the same reasons taken for *stipulatio*, or a *covenant*, nay we have in our *Holy-okes Etymological Dictionary*, *rogare, stipulari*, and surely the Law it self is nothing but a *covenant*. I say for the same reasons; for as *Pomponius* tells us, *Stipulatio*, was, *Verborum conceptio quibus is qui interrogatur dicturum facturumve se quod interrogatus est, responderit*, *A conception of words wherewith he that was asked, did answer that he would say or do the thing which he was asked; and that it took its name from the Interrogator, as the worthier person, was the opinion of Accursius and other Interpreters of the Law.* All which doth suit very well in our present case. For in Ancient times,

when the *Catechumeni*, who were to be Baptized, were interrogated by the *Priest*, whether they did believe in the Resurrection of the dead, and the life to come, upon their answer that they did, the covenant was accepted, and they were by him immediately Baptized in that Faith, as you may see in *Chrysostom* and others, the like custom whereunto is still retained in our *Church* when in time of *Baptism*, to the question of the *Minister*, *Wilt thou be Baptized in this Faith?* the *Sponsors* or *Sureties* forthwith answer, *it is our desire*. And this I take to be the *Apostles* meaning of ἐπερωτημα in this place. I have insisted the longer on these words, that I might more evidently shew, that the proper end of *Baptism* is to represent the death and Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, and our Faith in it, and not properly a sign of washing from the filth of sin, which the *Apostle* seems expressly in these words to deny, though many think or at least speak otherwise.

C. 4. v. 4. Ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται, μὴ συντρέχοντων ὑμῖς εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τὴν κοινίαν ἀνάχουσαν, βλασφημῶντες. By a familiar trajection, In quo hospitantur blasphemantes, non concurrentibus vobis in eandem luxuriæ confusionem, *Wherein they abide continue or rest or lodge themselves blaspheming, you not running together with them into the same excess of riot*. ξενίζεται, hospitatur, Act. c. 10. v. 6.

I. Ep. of S^t Peter. 313

V. 6. Ἐἰς τὐτο γδ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα
 κριθῶσι μὲν καὶ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ καὶ θεὸν
 πτόματι. I suppose in this place, to make
 the construction and the sense agree, you must
 understand the article, οἱ, before καὶ ἀνθρώπους,
 and before καὶ θεόν, a thing very frequent ; or
 resume the *Participle* πεπορόμενοι in the third
 verse, altering onely the case. And then render
 it, *For to this end was the Gospel preached to*
them that are dead, that they may be condemned
who were according to men in the flesh, but
that those who were according to God in the spi-
rit may live. Or thus, that they may be con-
demned who walked after men in the flesh, and
they live who walked after God in the spirit.

ANNO.

ANNOTATIONS

On the II. Ep. General

Of S. Peter.

Ch. I. v. 5. &c.

K A'I αὐτὸ τὸ αὐτὸ ὃ αὐδλῶ παρὰ
 συνέλκοντες ἐπιχορηγῶμεν ἐν τῇ πίστι
 ὑμῶν τῷ ἀρετῇ, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ
 τῷ γνῶσιν, &c. Before αὐδλῶ
 understand χ^1 , Ubique locus est accusativo si
 intelligas χ^1 , is a common rule, Et hoc ipsum
 cum omni diligentia introducentes, i. e. pro-
 moventes, jungite invicem cum fide virtutem,
 cum virtute scientiam, &c. And promoting this
 very thing [to wit that ye may be partakers of
 the divine nature, v. 4.] with all diligence,
 join hand in hand with your Faith virtue, with
 your vertue knowledge, with your knowledge tem-
 perance, with your temperance patience, with
 your patience godliness, with your godliness
 brotherly kindness, and with your brotherly
 kindness charity. ἐν is frequently put for αὐ.
 I cannot but think that the Apostle in this
 place

place had some reflection on the Ancient customs of the *Heathen*, when they lead their *Chorus*. For ἐπιχορηγεῖν doth properly signifie, *Chorum ducere*, or in *Choro ducere*, *To lead a Chorus*, or in a *Chorus*, Now in their *Chorus*, συνεπλήκοντο ἀλλήλοις, they were complicated together, Steph. or as in *Homer*,

Ὁρχεῦντ' ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔχοντες,

They danced holding one anothers hands by the palm, waiting each on other, or *Ministring* each to other, from whence this word seemeth to have obtained these several significations. But behold here a goodly *Chorus* of *Graces*, where *Faith* leads the *Chorus*, and the rest of the *Graces* wait all upon her, as it were mutually joyned by the hands, and sustaining each the other. And this sense I suppose may well fit ἐπιχορηγεῖν, Col. c. 2. v. 19. and ἐπιχορηγία, Eph. c. 4. v. 16.

V. 20. Ὅτι πάντα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως ἐ γίνεται, Quod omnis Prophetia Scripturæ propria interpretatione non fit. Thus the *Interlineary* and the *Old Latin Interpreter*. That every Propheſie of Scripture is not fulfilled in the proper interpretation, or that every Prophecy is not fulfilled in the proper interpretation of the writing, or of what is written, taking γραφή, for *Scriptio*, or *Scriptum*, as it often is in humane Authors, γίνεται, δόκιμαίται, εἰς πλῆθος ἐνεργεῖται, Phavor. Though others

thers think it more *Grammatical* to Translate it thus, *Quod omnis Prophetia Scripturæ propriæ interpretationis non est, That every Prophecy of Scripture is not of its proper interpretation.* But Translate it which way you will the sense is still the same, all one as if he had said, *That every Prophecy was not accomplished according to the literal, that is the proper meaning of the Scripture.* For *Prophecies* have for the most part a *typical, mystical, or analogical* sense, though some time, some *Prophesie* hath a *literal* one, as that concerning *Josiah*, *1 King*, c. 13. v. 2. and some time a *literal* and *mystical*, *Isai.* c. 7. v. 14. and that of the Son of the *Prophets*, *Isai.* c. 8. v. 3, 4. As many of the *Fathers* do expound it. And this sense doth fitly agree with the context, v. 19. *We have also a more sure word of Prophesie whereunto ye do well that ye take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.* What I beseech you is this *light that shineth in a dark place*, but the *Prophecies of Christ*, in the proper interpretation of the *Scripture*, that is in the letter obscure and wrapped up in darkness, until the day star of the *Gospel* do manifest and declare the *type* and *mystery* in their hearts, and therefore he tells them, that *they ought to know this chiefly*, and to take heed that they stuck not too much in the naked letter, but that they should rather turn their minds to the meaning of the *Prophecy*, to the

I. Ep. of S^t John. 317

the mystery which was covered in the letter, or written word. For, as it follows, v. 21. *Prophe-
sie came not of old time by the will of man, that is,
they did not Prophecie in old time of their own
head according to their own will, but holy men
of God spake as they were inspired, and acted by
the holy spirit, in figures, riddles, types and myste-
ries, that those who saw γερων, the letter of
the Scripture, or the written word, might not see
ἐπίλυσιν, the solution, or interpretation of it, un-
less to whom the day star of the Gospel was
risen in their hearts.*

AN NOT A T I O N S

On the I. Ep. General Of S. John.

Ch. 2. v. 22.

TΙ Σ ἔστιν ὁ ψεύστης εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνέμεται
ὅτι Ἰησοῦς υἱὸν ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός, *To words
that are in themselves negative the
Atticks add a negation, whereof you
may see Animad. on 1 Tim. c. 4. v. 3. Who
is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the
Christ? he is Antichrist who denieth the Father
and the Son, Whosoever denieth the Son hath
not*

not the Father. It is unseasonable and needless to add those words which follow in the *English*, and are restored by them and *Beza* out of the *Syriack* and *Latin* copies, they being wanting in the *Greek*. To wit, *He that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also,* Which words are indeed altogether superfluous, and serve to no use, but rather destroy the sense. For those words, *Who ever denieth the Son, hath not the Father,* are a meer proof of the antecedent proposition, That he is *Antichrist who denieth the Father and the Son,* by an answer to a tacit objection. As if, if any should object, I am not *Antichrist*, for I do not Deny the *Father* and the *Son*, for I acknowledge the *Father*, it should be immediately replied, Yea, but thou art *Antichrist*, whoever thou art and sayest so, and deniest the *Son*, for he who denieth the *Son*, hath not the *Father*. For every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him that is begotten of him, c. 5. v. 1. And he who honoureth not the *Son*, honoureth not the *Father* who sent him, Joh. c. 5. v. 23.

ANNO

ANNOTATIONS ON The Revelation.

Ch. 2. v. 22.

IΔΟΥ ἔγω βάλλω αὐτῇ, εἰς κλίνην καὶ τὰς
μοιχοδούσας μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς θλίψιν μεγά-
λῃν, *Behold I will cast her and those that
commit fornication with her on the bed
into great affliction.* This trajection is so fa-
miliar, that I cannot but wonder that any should
scruple at it. Especially the common version
being so insignificant. The *Alexandrian* copy
reads φυλακῇ for κλίνῃ. And I will cast her
into prison, but because its single, I think we
are not to acquiesce in it, neither is the read-
ing altogether so pleasing that I am much de-
lighted with it.

Κ. 13. v. 8. Ὃν ἐ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα
ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆ ζωῆς τῷ ἀρνίῳ ἐσφαγμένῳ ἀπὸ
καταβολῆς κόσμου. If these words be under-
stood of the Lamb which was slain from the
foundation of the world, as many think, then
are

are they to be understood of *Christ* exhibited in the *type* of the *Lamb* which from the beginning of the world was slain by *Abel* for a Sacrifice, whereby he testified his Faith in *Christ* to come, and offer'd himself a Sacrifice for the sins of the world. But perhaps we may better say with the *Greek Scholiast*, Ἐν ὑπερβατῷ ἀκυσέον ὁ, ὡν γέγραπται· ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γέγραπται, *It is an Hyperbaton*, as if we were to read, *Whose names are not written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that was slain.* As were theirs which did not worship the *Dragon*, such as were in the *Greek Scholiast*, Πάντες οἱ δι' εὐσέβειαν μαρτυρέμενοι ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ, *All those that were Martyrs for their piety in the Old Testament*, as also *Luke* saith in his Gospel, c. 10. v. 20. *Rejoyce that your names are written in heaven.* And for confirmation of this *Hyperbaton*, we read c. 17. v. 8. *And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder*, Ὡς ἔ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τῆ ζωῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, *Whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world*, Where no mention at all is made of the *Lamb* that was slain, Which is a kind of demonstration, that the words are to be understood as they are before rendred according to the *Scholiast*.

F I N I S.

